DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 481 HE 020 285

AUTHOR Gilley, J. Wade; And Others
TITLE Administration of University Athletic Programs: Internal Control and Excellence.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.; George Mason Univ., Fairfax, Va.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 66p.; For Executive Summary, see ED 268 923.
AVAILABLE FROM George Mason University, (Dr. J. Wade Gilley), 4400 University Drive, Fairfax, VA 22030 ($5.50).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Responsibility; Case Studies; *College Athletics; *College Presidents; Educational Quality; Higher Education; Leadership; Power Structure; Private Colleges; Problem Solving; *Program Administration; Public Colleges; Questionnaires; School Surveys

ABSTRACT

The administration of athletic programs at National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I-A universities was studied in 1985. The study consisted of three parts: a survey of 65 university presidents concerning leadership and athletics, a historical look at problems in intercollegiate athletics; and a comparison of four universities with problems in their athletic departments and four universities viewed by peers as national examples of how to do things the right way. Responses to the president's survey represented 55 public universities and 10 private universities. On the average, they have eight men's and seven women's sports program. The four universities that had major athletics problems were the University of Florida, Tulane University, Clemson University, and Southern Methodist University. Four universities that had exemplary programs were the University of Michigan, Notre Dame University, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Virginia. A lack of internal control (including confused and fractured lines of responsibility) was found to be a critical factor contributing to problems in university athletic programs. Detailed findings, a list of surveyed schools, and the questionnaire are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED282481

Administration of University Athletic Programs:

Internal Control and Excellence

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Wade Dilley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE020 285

A Special Report From
George Mason University
and
American Council on Education

Additional copies of this GMU-ACE Special Report may be obtained by writing to:

Dr. J. Wade Gilley
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

Please enclose a check in the amount of $5.50 for postage and handling. No purchase orders can be accepted.

Administration of University Athletic Programs:

Internal Control and Excellence

by

J. Wade Gilley
Anthony A. Hickey

with

Mike Barnsback
Eleanor Gerber
Kim Sears

August 1986
American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Contents

Foreword . . . . . *v*

Preface and Acknowledgements . . . . . *vii*

Part I—The Findings

Chapter I. Introduction and Summary 3
J. Wade Gilley and Anthony A. Hickey

Chapter II. The Survey Methodology and Overview of Survey Results 11
Mike Barnsback and Anthony A. Hickey

Chapter III. History of Intercollegiate Athletics 17
Kim Sears and J. Wade Gilley

Chapter IV. Cheating in College Sports: A Qualitative Assessment 31
Eleanor Gerber and J. Wade Gilley

Part II—The Survey

II-A Detailed Survey Data 43

II-B Survey Form 55

II-C List of Institutions Surveyed 63

Foreword

Intercollegiate athletics is one of the most volatile areas in higher education. The reputations of many institutions and their leaders have been sullied by scandals growing out of the extreme pressures that surround big-time college athletics. Yet, despite the importance of the subject, there has been very little scholarship in this area.

Professors Gilley and Hickey have performed a real service to the leadership of our institutions through an empirical study of many of the issues that have been so troubling. Their study is important reading for those charged with administering athletic programs. ACE is pleased to be associated with the publication of their study.

Robert Atwell
President
American Council on Education

Preface and Acknowledgments

In the summer of 1985 when we formed our higher education issues study group, many important issues faced America's colleges and universities but none was more prominent than the continuing scandals and exposes in intercollegiate athletics. We chose to study the administration of university athletic programs for two reasons: first, because of the immediacy of the topic; and secondly, because of its relationship to our longer term series of studies on high education leadership.

In addition to the two of us, the study group included: Dr. Eleanor Gerber, research associate at the George Mason Institute; Kim Sears, athletic academic coordinator; and Mike Barnsback, a graduate student in sociology. The study consisted of three parts: a survey of 138 NCAA Division I-A university presidents on leadership and athletics; a historical look at problems in intercollegiate athletics; and a comparison of four universities with problems in their athletic departments and four universities viewed by their peers as national examples of how to do things the right way.

The basic finding of this study is that presidential leadership is just as critical to the proper administration of university athletic programs as in other significant university endeavors. Secondary findings include the fact that colleges and universities have struggled to reconcile their basic adademic missions with auxiliary entertainment-oriented athletic programs for almost a hundred years—or since the introduction of intercollegiate sporting events in the 1850s.

Finally, we would like to express our appreciation to those providing assistance and support: Dr. George W. Johnson, president of George Mason University; Dr. Kenneth Fulmer; Mrs. Mary Krais; and the George Mason Institute.

J. Wade Gilley
Anthony A. Hickey

Part I
The Findings

Chapter I

Administration of University Athletic Programs: Internal Control and Exellence

Introduction and Summary

by

J. Wade Gilley
Anthony A. Hickey

A study of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I-A universities found that lack of internal control (including confused and fractured lines of responsibility) is a critical factor contributing to problems in university athletic programs.

In addition, the study revealed that: (1) some presidents do not have board backing for "taking charge"; (2) presidents, on the average, are planning to do something besides being president within five years or less; (3) presidents see money, pressure to win, and over-zealous supporters, including alumni, as the key factors in athletic problems; and yet (4) presidents see alumni and corporate support growing in importance in the years ahead if the academic quality of their institutions is to improve.

These findings were based on comprehensive responses of 65 university presidents to a survey in the summer of 1985. In addition, eight case studies were completed—four of institutions under NCAA sanctions and four of institutions with acknowledged success in blending excellence in athletics with excellence in adademics.

There is a clear consensus among the presidents as to which universities in America have successfully blended excellence in athletics with well-established excellence in academics. Those institutions are Stanford University, the University of Michigan, Notre Dame University, Duke University, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Virginia. While the survey focused exclusively on Division I-A institutions, many presidents in responding commented that, in the words of one, "Many Division I-AA institutions are very successful at this."

The survey also revealed the following additional perceptions regarding university athletic programs.

- Ninety-two percent of the presidents believe that there are major problems in athletic programs across the nation.
- Only one-third are fearful of problems at their institutions.
- Twenty-two percent acknowledge having serious problems at their universities.

- Athletic problems only rank fourth among critical issues currently facing these presidents, with funding, internal governance, and external governance ranking higher.
- Most believe that problems in athletic programs will fade in importance within five years, with funding, enrollments, academic quality, change, faculty issues, and public support ranking higher.
- There are significant differences between the ways exemplary institutions and other universities organize and control their athletic programs.
- The presidents perceive a lessening of pressure to expand women's athletics but expect to see problems similar to those in men's programs develop in women's programs.

The Study

This project was undertaken in spring 1985 in an effort to gain insight into the thinking of university presidents about athletic programs, the administration of their athletic programs, and the impact of problems of athletic programs on university leadership. One hundred thirty-eight NCAA Division I-A university presidents were surveyed during summer 1985. Seventy-five responded to the survey, with 65 providing usable responses.

Fifty-five of the responding universities are public, while the other ten are private. Student enrollments range from 5,000 to 56,000, with the median enrollment being 16,400. On the average, they have eight men's and seven women's sports programs.

The study included additional research on two groups of institutions. An associate, Dr. Eleanor Gerber, concurrently developed four case studies of universities having major athletics problems: the University of Florida, Tulane University, Clemson University and Southern Methodist University. After identification of the seven exemplary institutions via the survey responses, mini case studies were completed on four—Michigan, Notre Dame, Pennsylvania State, and Virginia. The information provided in these eight case studies served to support or refute findings from the survey.

The Findings of Internal Control as a Problem

The primary finding of internal control problems and a disjointed administrative structure came from two sources: the survey of presidents and the case studies.

In the survey, presidents were asked to assign a level of responsibility—one for low and five for high—of certain persons and groups (president, academic vice president, other vice presidents, athletic director, etc.) in the control of areas such as budget, academics for athletes, appointment of coaches, audits, and student financial assistance for athletes. The results are shown in the Figure 1 matrix.

Figure 1 – Athletic Control Matrix for All Institutions

	Budget	Academics	Appointment of Coaches	Auditing	Student Aid	Total
President	235	169	200	208	154	966
Academic V. Pres.	108	197	99	89	109	602
Other V. Pres.	152	80	106	156	127	621
Athletic Dir.	235	191	249	198	225	1098
Coaches	159	171	94	89	167	680
TOTAL	889	808	748	740	782	3967

Analysis of the survey results reveals the following:

1. The athletic director is the central and most powerful figure on campus in regard to all aspects of the program of student athletics. The president is clearly second in power.
2. It appears that the president, vice presidents, board, and athletic director share responsibility for the athletic budget in a major way.
3. Although the budget is the key financial administrative interest at most institutions, student athlete financial assistance is firmly in the control of coaches and the athletic director.
4. The NCAA is seen as a key player in the student financial assistance area, but as having no significant role in budget, academics, audits, or the appointment of coaches.
5. Alumni, boosters, and athletic conferences are not seen as major factors in controlling athletic programs.

To contrast these general findings for the 65 institutions, we analyzed the responses of four institutions identified as exemplary. Michigan, Notre Dame, Penn State, and Virginia. The findings are displayed in Figure 2.

Figure 2 – Athletic Control Matrix for Four Exemplary Institutions

	Budget	Academics	Appointment of Coaches	Auditing	Student Aid	Total
President	20	20	16	20	17	95
Academic V.P.	19	13	10	10	9	61
Other V.P.	20	17	18	19	19	93
Athletic Dir.	18	17	18	15	14	82
TOTAL	71	67	62	64	59	331

In contrast with the larger sample of 65, following are the results for these institutions.

- The president emerges as the most powerful figure, followed by a vice president other than academic vice president. The athletic director rated third. The administrative or executive vice president is an important figure. The athletic director is a leading administrator (in terms of control) only in the appointment of coaches.
- The top administrators of exemplary institutions see themselves more in control (or more responsible for) academics and student financial assistance than is the case in the larger group, with less of a role for the NCAA.

Comparative statistical analysis of the four exemplary institutions with responses from the 65 gave an indication that the locus of internal control may be crucial. Further information from the survey and the case studies provides strong supporting evidence. The following is a summary of our findings.

- Of the 68 percent of presidents indicating no fear of problems in their athletic programs, an overwhelming majority (96%) gave strong internal control as the reason for their confidence.
- In all of the four case studies of institutions under NCAA sanctions, there was clear evidence of lack of administrative control and even confusion as to the actual chain of command. In

one case, the athletic director did not appear on the university's primary administrative organizational chart; although the personnel director and the computer czar did. At another university, the athletic director/football coach technically reports to a vice president for operations and the athletic budget is under control of a financial vice president; yet athletic policy is made by an athletic council, while the athletic director/coach is actually employed and paid by a quasi-university organization on which the operations vice president is just one member of the board.

- In another well known university, the president did not have the authority to hire, fire, or reassign the athletic director. After four major clashes with the NCAA over more than a decade, this president took a recommendation to his board of trustees to reassign the athletic director and ended up being "reassigned" himself.

- In the 65-university survey, 70 percent of the presidents expressed confidence that "university presidents can resolve the athletic dilemma: by simply taking control. The other 30 percent felt that control could best be exerted through their conference of the NCAA.

- Comparative analysis of the two matrices revealed that the larger sample of 65 universities rely far more heavily on the NCAA in the academic program and student financial assistance areas than do the exemplary institutions. In fact, the presidents of the four exemplary institutions responding to the survey wrote in the following statement: "We just make sure that we follow the NCAA rules."

- The presidents list poor administrative control (20%) second, just behind competitive pressure (23%), and ahead of academics (12%), as a key problem in athletic programs.

The Presidents

The survey was designed to elicit information that would provide insight into the outlook of the university presidents surveyed and to determine whether actual or perceived problems with athletic programs are affecting either their outlook or perceived ability to lead. Results include the following information.

- The 65 presidents have a median tenure in office of five years. (The range is one year to 33 years.) The median expectation of additional tenure is five years. Cross checking of the data revealed that the 22 percent of presidents acknowledging athletic problems in their universities as well as the 30 percent fearful of problems had about the same outlook regarding tenure expectations as the larger group of 65.

- However, when asked about their future career plans, only 22 percent expect to stay in higher education as an administrator or faculty member. Other expectations included retirement (27%), a position in business or government (30%), or "something different." Again, there was no differentiation between those with problems in their athletic programs and the larger group.

- The presidents gave the following responses to the question, "What are the most critical issues I presently deal with on a regular basis?"

Funding	34%
Internal Governance	21%
External Governance	14%
Athletics	8%
Enrollments	5%
Others	18%

- When asked about their expectations of critical issues in five years, the presidents gave the following responses.

Funding	33%
Enrollments	16%
Academic Quality	17%
Change	10%
Faculty Issues	8%
Public Support	9%
Athletics	6%
Others	9%

- In response to a question about future sources of university funding, the presidents indicated an expectation of about the same from state government (60%), less from the federal government (60%), more from alumni (73%), and more from business and industry (83%).
- The presidents thought that it is more important for presidents to possess a strategic vision for the university and forge a good working relationship with the board and faculty than to encourage individual initiative, provide educational leadership, or present good ideas.
- Fifty-nine percent of the 65 presidents see continued pressure to support women's athletic programs as coming from the president or university policy rather than from external sources (15%). They do expect that women's athletic programs will continue to develop some of the same problems as now haunt the men's programs.
- The presidents see money, overzealous supporters and alumni pressures as contributing significantly to current athletic problems. Organized crime and drugs are not seen as important.

Case Studies

The case studies of four universities under some form of NCAA sanction or investigation revealed a pattern of serious problems. A brief summary of those generic problems follows.

- unclear lines of responsibility and authority;
- distant or laissez-faire approach by presidents until problems appear in the press and the faculty demands attention; and
- athletic departments separate from the rest of the university and operating in an autonomous or semi-autonomous manner.

This situation permits fiscal, academic, and ethical abuses to occur easily, stay hidden, and spread quietly.

It is clear that the pressure to win is being intensified as revenues fall in the wake of the breaking of the NCAA monopoly on television rights. Many athletic programs have large capital debts which, coupled with falling revenues, make universities more susceptible to pressure from large donors. In most institutions, these large donors loom very large in the eye of university presidents. The lack of control of boosters has caused more problems for these universities than academics or any other aspect of athletics.

Faculty-athletic program relations are a problem in many universities. On one hand, powerful athletic directors bully and pressure academic departments while, on the other, faculties are at times hostile to athletics, often because they are misinformed.

Substantially different standards for admission of student athletes result in low graduation rates and charges of exploitation. Athletes tend to have at least as good counseling and academic support services as other students but substantially beefed-up assistance for student athletes is being widely endorsed.

There is a tendency at universities with problems to use the NCAA as a whipping boy. This tactic deflects attention away from inadequate internal administration and control. At the same time, there is substantial interest on the part of many presidents in strengthening the hand of the NCAA through new and different rules and stronger enforcement efforts.

A cursory review of these situations quickly brings us to the realization that the root cause of the problem in university athletic programs is the lack of strong internal control and administration. This includes out-of-control boosters who are tolerated by university administrations.

Systemic Problems and Proposed Solutions

There is a broad range of athletic problems being experienced by many (if not most) universities. They include competitive pressure, improper recruiting practices, the paying of prospective student athletes to sign with particular schools, drugs and organized crime involvement, falsifying records, low graduation rates, charges of exploitation, and difficulties in administering programs. The knowledge of these problems and others is so widespread as to obviate the necessity for any discussion here except for one point—the problems may be endemic to the system.

One of the first recorded intercollegiate athletic events in the mid-1800s was beset with problems familiar to colleges and universities today—money and ineligible participants. This event was the first regatta between Harvard and Yale, which was sponsored by the Elkins Railroad line and was used to promote the railroad. The boating race kicked off intercollegiate athletics with commercialization, spectators, prize money and eligibility questions. The eligibility question arose when Harvard, which won the race, used a Harvard alumnus as their coxswain.

These problems and others have been endemic to inter-collegiate athletics for over 100 years. At times, such as 1905 when 18 football players were killed and another 100 severely injured, the problems result in national attention. Only then are solutions, such as forming the NCAA, sought.

Now the universities are once again seeking solutions. In reviewing published accounts of proposed solutions to athletic problems, we discovered several interesting possibilities being discussed in academic circles, including the following.

Substantial attention is being focused on actions at the NCAA level, with the two most prominent being (1) raising academic standards for freshman eligibility in an effort to resolve the problem of poor graduation rates and other academic issues at a system level; and (2) stronger enforcement efforts and harsher penalties for violators of NCAA rules.

Some athletic directors, coaches, and economists are discussing openly paying student athletes. These proposals range from paying each athlete $100 per month to negotiating with each recruit on an individual-worth basis. The first case raises the problem of spending money for the many student athletes who are economically disadvantaged, and the second indicates that colleges and universities are economically exploiting the most gifted athletes.

Two other solutions focus on academics and finances. An unusual solution to the academic problems of student athletes was proposed by a faculty member and a student athlete at Syracuse University in the September 25, 1985 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education.* They advocate the establishment of vocational/technical institutes as university subsidiaries so that a student incapable of competing in an academic environment will have a means of earning a living as a welder or auto mechanic if the student does not make the grade as a professional athlete.

A solution to university financial problems as well as athlete academic questions currently being discussed by some is to externalize the problem by creating a professional sports sponsored farm club/minor league system for the revenue sports. These farm clubs could be loosely affiliated with universities, with some athletes actually being students.

While the possibilities for these solutions vary widely, none really focuses on the central problem revealed by this study, that of internal control.

Conclusions

It is obvious to any observer of higher education and sports in this country that intercollegiate athletics at the highest competitive level, NCAA Division I-A, are in deep trouble. This view is reinforced by the results of this study. However, the study reveals that the key to this problem is not simply with the stricter enforcement of more complex NCAA rules. *It is clear that strong presidential leadership, clear lines of authority and responsibility, and tighter internal university control are required.*

The question is: will the presidents be able, in the words of one long-term and distinguished president, to "take charge"? Perhaps it is too much to ask presidents to take courageous (some might say foolhardy) stands to enable their institutions to take charge of their own destinies. Perhaps that is why the NCAA with complex rules and harsher sanctions looks so good to many presidents.

On the other hand, perhaps presidents can ill afford not to take charge. In the words of legendary University of North Carolina President William Friday, "It is clear that presidents must act, must lead, must show courage unless they want national disapproval!"

Chapter II

The Survey Methodology and Overview of Results

by
Mike Barnsback
Anthony A. Hickey

A survey of university presidents was conducted to examine their views on the role of the university president and the issue of intercollegiate athletics. The survey was divided into three sections. The first section explored how the presidents view their position. The presidents were asked about the most difficult issues that they must currently face and those issues that they anticipate for the future. The importance of specific leadership qualities was also examined, as well as, tenure and career plans.

The second section deals with issues concerning intercollegiate athletics. The survey inquired as to whether the presidents believed there to be serious problems with athletic programs at universities in general. More specifically, it was asked if they had identified problems at their university or were fearful of possible problems with their athletic program. The factors involved in the problems of athletic programs and the role of the president in resolving the problems were examined. The presidents were also asked to rate the amount of control various positions within the university and organizations connected with the university, such as the NCAA, exert over elements of athletic programs. Finally, universities were identified that were believed to have good reputations for excellence in both athletics and academics and have the situation well under control.

The third section explored women's athletics. The amount of pressure on the presidents to support women's athletics was investigated. The sources of the pressure and the future of women's athletic programs were the final issues dealt with.

The survey was sent to all university presidents whose institutions participated in division-I athletics. A total of 135 presidents were included in the sample. The surveys were mailed out late in June of 1985. By the end of August, 59 completed surveys were returned. As a follow up, surveys were sent again to the presidents that did not reply initially. The follow up effort netted 8 additional surveys. The total sample size for the final analysis was 67 which resulted in a 49.6% response rate.

The survey was constructed in two stages. In the first stage, an initial draft of the survey was administered to selected individuals within George Mason University. The individuals were encouraged to provide critical comments about the survey. The suggestions in response to the pretest of the survey were used to develop the final draft of the questionnaire.

In its final form, the survey was divided into three parts. As mentioned previously, the sections dealt with leadership issues for university presidents, intercollegiate athletics, and women's athletics. The questionnaire consisted of a total of twenty-one questions. It took approximately fifteen minutes

to complete the form. The survey was sent out in the form of a three-page booklet printed on 8½ by 11 inch white paper. The first page of the booklet was a cover page. The survey itself was printed on the front and back of the remaining two pages (see Part II-B).

The Leadership section of the survey consisted of seven questions dealing with various issues of concern to university presidents. The first two questions dealt with the career plans of the respondents. Question One was simply stated, "How many more years do you think that you will stay in your current position?" The question was intended to illicit a single year as a response. Some respondents, however, gave a range of a probable number of years that they might remain in the position, such as 5 to 10 years. In those cases, a rounded average was taken to provide a single response.

The second question explored the various reasons why the respondents might leave their current position. The question was worded, "Why will you leave?" The selection of answers were restricted to the following: (1) to do something different, (2) to accept another position, (3) to retire, (4) to go into business, industry, or government, and (5) to go into teaching full time.

Question Three asked about the tenure of each respondent. The question was stated, "How long have you been in your current position?" If a respondent had been in a position for less than a year, the response was coded with a zero to indicate that president was new to the position. All other responses that indicated fractions of a year were rounded to the nearest whole year.

The fourth question was the first of eight open ended questions included in the survey. The question was worded, "What are the three most difficult issues you have to deal with as president?" It was anticipated that there are a wide range of issues that university presidents deal with. Allowing the presidents freedom to respond in an open ended format permitted a greater representation of all the possible issues.

The most difficult issues reported fell into seven general categories. The first category involved issues concerning funding. All responses that mentioned any aspect of funding, including such topics as salaries and building maintenance, were placed under the funding category. The second category was that of internal governance. Internal governance referred to the issues the president must deal with within the university. Problems with the management of personnel such as promotion, tenure, grievances, and evaluations were included within this category. Also included were issues of academic quality, planning, and student concerns. The third category of responses dealt with issues of external governance. Interactions with the administration, chancellors, regents, and the board constituted external governance. Relations external to the university made up the fourth category. Relations with the state and federal government and regional politics were covered. Concern over the image of the university were also included in the category. Athletic issues fell under the fifth category. The sixth category of responses was concerned with enrollment and recruiting of students. The final category served as a general catch all. Any response that could not be placed in the first six categories was included under the "other" label.

The response categories for this open ended question and all others included in the survey were constructed in two separate responses to a question and then grouped the responses into tentative categories. In the next stage, the response list and tentative categories were reviewed by other researchers. The general categories and individual responses to be included in each category were arrived at by agreement of the research team. All open ended questions contained an "other" category to represent responses that could not be adequately grouped. The review process insured that all individual responses were representative of the response categories that they were included in.

The fifth question in the Leadership section asked the respondents, "How would you rate the importance of the following leadership qualities to a successful president?" A list of leadership qualities identified by the research team were provided. The list of qualities was as follows: (1) Possessing a strategic vision for the institution. (2) Forging a good working relationship with, (1) the board, (b) the faculty, (c) the external community. (3) Building teamwork. (4) Encourage individual initiative. (5) Providing educational professional leadership. (6) Having good ideas yourself. The respondents were asked to rate each quality by checking the appropriate column labeled "very important," "important," or "not important."

Question Six inquired into what issues the presidents believed would be important in the next five years. To elicit a wide range of responses an open ended format was used. The specific question read, "What are the three most important issues that university presidents will face in the next five

years?" This question was similar to Question Four which asked for three current issues. There were, however, a different range of responses encountered in Question Six.

The presidents saw less of a concern over governance issues in the future. Funding, athletics, and enrollment remained as response categories. Replacing issues of governance were concerns over the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty, responding to change, and maintaining academic quality. Also, the presidents indicated that increasing the amount of industrial and public support of higher education would arise as an issue in the next five years.

The final question of the Leadership section asked, "How much support do you believe higher education can expect over the next decade from the following sectors?" The sectors inquired about were the federal government, the state government, alumni, and business and industry. The respondents rated the amount of support expected by checking the appropriate column labeled, "more," "about the same," or "less" for each sector.

The section of the questionnaire dealing with intercollegiate athletics contained nine questions. The questions focused on the issues concerning the problems with athletics at the university level. The first question asked for a descriptive statement about what major division I-A sports that the respondent's university participates in. The respondents checked football, basketball, or both if appropriate. This question served as a good measure for the size of the athletic program of the institution.

Question Two established if a president believed there to be problems with intercollegiate athletics in general. The statement, "There are serious problems with athletic programs at many universities," was presented. The respondent checked either yes or no to indicate whether they agreed or not with the statement.

Questions Three and Four were specifically concerned with the athletic programs of the particular institutions that the presidents represented. Both questions were designed with two parts. In the first section, a general statement was given that required the respondent to express agreement by checking either yes or no. If the statement was agreed with, the respondent was directed to supply details in an open ended format.

In the third question, the following statement was presented, "I am fearful of the possibility of serious problems in our athletic program." If the respondent was in agreement with the statement, he was simply asked, "Why?" Responses to the open ended portion of the question fell into five general categories. The potential problems that the presidents identified were funding, competitive pressure to win, academics of athletes, the interference of alumni and boosters, and drugs and other related discipline issues. Those presidents who were not fearful of problems attributed their security to the following categories of factors: (1) good internal control of athletics, (2) NCAA control, and (3) small athletic programs.

Question Three was concerned with the possibility of problems with athletics. Question Four, on the other hand, asked if the presidents had found actual problems with their athletic programs. The statement, "We have serious problems with our athletic program" was given. Agreement with the statement directed the respondent to the question, "What is the nature of your problems?" It is interesting to note that the actual problems identified in athletic programs were very similar to the potential problems expected by many presidents. The responses were so similar, in fact, that the same response categories used in the previous question were employed.

The next two questions turned the focus away from individual athletic programs back to collegiate athletics in general. The questions inquired into the factors behind the problems with athletics at the university level. The fifth question was stated, "What are the primary factors in the potential destabilization of college athletics?" A list of five factors believed to be relevant was provided. The respondents were directed to check as many of the factors that they felt applied. The factors included in the list were money, overzealous supporters, alumni/fan pressure for winners, organized crime, and drugs.

Question Six also addressed the factors contributing to the problems of collegiate athletics. The respondents were asked, "What are the most important factors involved in the problems of athletic programs at many universities?" The question used an open ended design to give the presidents freedom to identify factors not mentioned in the previous question. The responses were grouped into the following categories of factors: (1) lack of administrative control over athletic programs, (2) fund-

ing of athletic programs, (3) pressure to be competitive and win, (4) drug and discipline problems among athletes, (5) recruiting violations, (6) overzealous and unethical alumni and boosters, and (7) academics of athletes. A maximum of three factors were taken from each respondent. In cases where more than three factors were supplied, only the first three listed were included in the analysis.

The seventh question established the amount of power that different individuals and groups associated with intercollegiate athletics command over various elements of athletic programs. The question was stated, "There are many individuals and groups that are involved in controlling athletic programs at NCAA division I-A universities. For your institution please rate the following individuals/groups from 1-5 (high to low) in terms of how much control they have over various elements of athletic programs." The individuals/groups were listed as row headings and the elements of athletic programs were listed as column headings. The result was a matrix of the amount of power that each individual or group has over the elements of the athletic program. The individuals/groups included in the matrix were the President, Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost, Other Vice President (title supplied by respondent), Athletic Director, Coaches, Alumni, Governing Board, Athletic Boosters, NCAA, and Accreditation Organizations. The elements of athletic programs included the Budget, Academic Programs of Athletes, Appointment of Coaches, Auditing, and Financial Aid for Athletes.

Question Eight examined the role of university presidents in solving the problems of intercollegiate athletic programs. The presidents were first asked, "In your opinion, can university presidents resolve this dilemma?" Responses were indicated by checking either yes or no. If the respondent believed that university presidents could resolve the dilemma, details were asked for as to how the task could be accomplished. If not, the respondent was asked about who they felt could solve the problems.

This question generated some confusion among the respondents. Many respondents did not restrict their answer to simply checking yes or no as directed. One group of respondents was unclear about what particular "dilemma" was referred to in the question. Another group indicated that they were unsure that university presidents could act to resolve the problems. Finally, some respondents did not believe that a dilemma existed. To account for the confusion in the analysis, the three categories of responses were accounted for.

The request for details about how the presidents could resolve the problems generated a limited range of responses. Only two response categories could be constructed. The first group of responses was that the presidents must personally take control of the situation. Second, the presidents must work collectively or in conjunction with the athletic conferences and the NCAA. There were no appropriate responses indicating who could solve the dilemma if the presidents were not able to themselves.

The final question of the Athletics section turned the focus away from a discussion of the problems with athletic programs to the identification of programs with good reputations. The question was stated, "Do you know of any division I-A universities which have good reputations for excellence in both athletics and academics and have the situation well under control?" Responses were indicated by checking either yes or no. The respondents were then asked to name three to five such universities.

The final section of the survey dealt with the future of women's athletic programs. In light of the passage of Title IX, the presidents were asked, "Do you feel the same degree of urgency and pressure to support women's athletic programs now as in the past year?" Respondents checked either yes or no. The question continued, "If the answer is yes where is the pressure coming from?" Three response categories were constructed from answers to this open ended question. In the first, the presidents indicated that the pressure came from themselves or university policy. In the second, pressure came from groups within the university such as faculty and students. The third category accounted for all pressures external to the university such as the NCAA, Title IX, and athletic conferences.

The next question inquired, "Do you expect to continue expanding women's athletic programs at your university in the immediate future?" Responses were indicated by checking either yes or no.

The third question looked into the comparative sizes of women's athletic programs and men's programs. Respondents were asked, "How many women's athletic programs does your university now sponsor?" and, "How many men's programs?"

The next two questions inquired about the potential for problems with women's athletics. The potential problems with women's programs were compared to existing problems with men's pro-

grams. The first question was stated, "Do you anticipate that women's athletic programs will begin to experience some of the same problems that men's programs are now having?" The respondents checked yes or no. After having established if there would be similar problems, the following question asked, "Do you anticipate different problems with women's programs?" If the respondent checked "yes," he was directed to state what different problems might arise. It is interesting to note that although many presidents anticipated different problems with women's programs, for the most part, the problems cited were the same ones encountered in men's programs. The response categories included issues concerning finances, competitive pressure, control over programs, and a category of responses that indicated that the problems would be the same as in men's programs. The only problem cited that differed from problems with men's programs was a concern for the acceptance and support of women's programs.

The final two questions of the survey were descriptive statements about the institution that the presidents represented. The total enrollment of the institution was inquired into. Also, it was determined if the institution was public or private.

The general analysis conducted on the data produced by the survey counted the frequency of various responses for each question. In order to facilitate the analysis, all the responses were numerically coded and entered into a computer file. To insure the accuracy of the data file, randomly selected cases were double checked using the raw data from the survey and the code sheets constructed. The data file consisted of a total of one hundred and ten variables which represented all the requested responses or the survey.

It was possible for a single question to have more than one variable associated with it. For example, in open ended questions requesting several responses, such as the question asking for the three most important issues that a president must deal with, each response (issue) constituted a separate variable. In the example question, and as well as all other open ended questions, the first response listed became the first variable for that question, the second became the second variable, and so on. In the question dealing with the issues, the variables "first issue," "second issue," and "third issue" were constructed.

The construction and association of the variables had implications for the analysis. There were two methods of conducting a frequency analysis on the example question. A frequency analysis was to be run on each variable associated with the question. In the case of the issues question, three separate analyses were to be run, one for each variable. The second method grouped the responses for all three variables together to produce a frequency analysis that included all the possible responses for all the variables. Both techniques were used on all the appropriate questions in the analysis.

There were questions that were improperly filled out or left blank producing missing data for the analysis. Data considered to be missing took on three forms. The first form was encountered in instances where the respondent replied that he did not know the answer to the question. Inappropriate answers or answers that were not applicable to the questions constituted the second type of missing data. The final category of missing data included illegible responses and questions left unanswered. The three types of missing data were incorporated into the coding scheme and reported in the frequency analysis.

Michael E. Barnsback, 11-8-85

Chapter III

History of Intercollegiate Athletics

by
Kim Sears
J. Wade Gilley

A review of the literature reveals that athletes have always received prizes, privileges, or payments that seemed inconsistent with their performance. In ancient Greece, there were paid trainers and coaches; victors of athletic contests were given special privileges, exemptions, and or expensive gifts. Today high schools and colleges have unwittingly entered the entertainment field through their sports programs, and that step has created ethical problems for these institutions. There is money to be made in sports—money that can tempt coaches and players to cheat. According to one authority who has studied the subject, since the beginning of intercollegiate athletics, "infractions have been the rule . . . and nothing has changed in the equation of talent and greed since then" (12:44).

At the same time sport is the microcosm of any society, and therefore reflects the mores, values, and general culture of that society[1] (9:51). Traditionally, American culture has been predominantly business oriented. Intercollegiate sport, as we know it today, stems from the era of the "robber barons," a time of increasing industrialization and urbanization. Industrialization brought increased leisure time for the wealthy, which allowed them to develop sports and participate as well. With the rise of the middle class, more and more people became involved in sports as participants or fans. Improved modes of transportation made it possible for sports to become big spectator events: this in turn led to the merging of athletics and entertainment.

Commercialization of Athletics Was Not Far Behind

Commercialization fosters a "win at all costs" philosophy. A vicious circle has been created by this philosophy: winning produces larger gate receipts, which finance the recruitment of better athletes. The quality of the team improves, producing even bigger winners. With the influx of booster money and modern developments, such as television, the professionalization of the amateur athlete also is under way. Who is really in control of intercollegiate athletics—the institution, its athletic department, or the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the supposed regulator of intercollegiate sports?

Today, intercollegiate athletics must be examined from a sociological aspect as well. Sport in America today is, to some extent, a social safety valve that has replaced the western frontier. The pioneer life allowed the individual to live by homesteading and working the land (43:80). Sport, on

the other hand, gives urbanites an opportunity to improve their economic status by exerting their energies, sometimes in a dramatic rags-to-riches fashion. This, too, can present problems, because money and winning at all costs can become all-important: "The abuses of athletes are in the direction of excess, inordinate desire to win at any cost, the spirit of commercialism, and the tendencies to professionalism and to gambling" according to Frederick Cozens and Florence Stumpf (13:59). The NCAA has attempted to cope with this development and other results of cultural change by imposing more stringent sanctions against gambling, illegal recruiting, and other infractions.

How Intercollegiate Sport Began

A look at the history of sport reveals that intercollegiate athletics developed partly out of boredom with classes—students needed an outlet and a way to express themselves, release tension, and prove their worth. In 1843, intraschool sport was a significant part of campus life and consisted largely of student challenge matches. Intercollegiate sport began with boat races between Harvard and Yale universities. The first regatta between Harvard and Yale was sponsored by Elkins railroad line. The event was used to promote the railroad—an auspicious start for intercollegiate athletics.

Like modern collegiate contests, the early boat race was characterized by commercialization, crowds of spectators, prize money, and an eligibility question. The question arose because Harvard, which won the race, used an alumnus as boat coxswain. Even in the first intercollegiate contest, winning was considered a necessity and institutional pride was associated with victory.

The period between 1850 and 1900 was a time of urbanization and industrialization, the major forces behind change in sport. Many spontaneous sports were becoming commercially appealing to a particular social class. Team sports were becoming the rule. The development of large stadiums and field houses led to a proliferation of sports activities and also accommodated more spectators. The wealthy began to sponsor teams; thus sports became more commercialized and spectator oriented. Students from upper- and middle-class families were likely to attend college and participate in athletics, but lower-class urban youths were kept out by lack of money, lack of space for practice, and lack of equipment. Consequently, they became spectators rather than participants.

Industrialization also spawned new technological developments in communications and transportation. More spectators and teams could afford to travel, increasing competition and, needless to say, gate receipts. Sports boomed during the "Gilded Age" of industrialization.

Controlling Intercollegiate Teams

The rowing clubs had set a precedent for student-run organizations in the early days of intercollegiate athletics, raising their own funds, purchasing equipment, and constructing facilities. In the 1850s, the boating organizations were initiated, coached, administered, and financed by students. The captain was indispensable. He assured the continuance of the organization, served as its coach and administrator, organized fund raisers, and promoted his club; he was the sole arbiter of the athletic program, although team managers controlled the scheduling of contests and the purse strings.

With the growth of intercollegiate play and its expenses, however, came the need for more financial support. Athletic associations arose to take care of the problem. At most colleges, different sports programs combined under one athletic association, which provided administrative manpower, directed fund raiser, and collected yearly dues, as well as gate receipts. With all the new activities however, sports began to challenge the academic curriculum for students, taking their time, interest, and effort. Faculty then attempted to place student-run athletics programs under tighter educational control, and the conflict over control of athletics began.

Faculty control developed partly because the United States lacked a dominating class of gentlemen, a factor that also may have contributed to American athletes' passion for winning. Their desire to win is so strong that they subordinate everything else to it, so that "success in athletics is synonymous with victory. To be victorious, is to conquer" (55:136). This philosophy led recruiters, coaching professionals, and students to matriculate to winning colleges. Athletes in the 19th century often were flattered or promised social favors by suitor schools: they could participate as long as they

wanted, transfer at will, and receive tuition, meals, scholarships, and extras. Mr. Hogan, while attending Yale, was a prime example of the glorified athlete. "Hogan had a suite of rooms in the dorm, free meals at the university club, a one-hundred-dollar scholarship, he could sell programs and keep the profit, and was made an agent of the American Tobacco Company, receiving a commission on cigarettes sold in New Haven, plus a 10-day paid vacation to Cuba" (55:208). The need to hire a coach who could produce winners intensified recruiting problems.

As amateur athletics began to get out of hand, faculties tried to develop policies to control the programs. The first set of rules regulated time, place, and the number of games played, in an attempt to enhance academic time. Faculty also were concerned about negative aspects of sport—questionable sportsmanship and values of the athletes, the relationship of the athletes to the entire student body and the commercialization and professionalization of athletics. They believed that older, more responsible persons—not student-athletes—should be in charge (35:216). The athletic programs always seemed to be in debt, increasing costs and creating other financial difficulties. Faculty felt that if they could control the purse strings, they could deflect other problems associated with money.

There were still other problems, however. A sort of rule-breaking spirit existed that tolerated things like securing favored officials for home games and spying on future opponents' closed-door practices. Glorification of the athletes created a sense that winning was more important than intellectual effort. Athletic departments even were accused of encouraging "gladiatorial" i.e., brutal sports.

Faculty did recognize some positive outcomes of sport—the stressing of discipline to improve order; the provision of an outlet for students' "superabundant animal energy" (53:330); the institutional pride and allegiance associated with games as students rallied to support their alma mater. The public's image of the college student changed from one of unhealthy effeminancy to robust virility. Athletics also led to an increase in overall enrollment, making a wider selection of courses possible.

Faculty had difficulty gaining control of the athletic associations. At the time athletic departments were forming, college presidents were in tune with materialism and took the approach that athletics advertised the university and directly correlated with increased enrollment. College presidents became active marketing agents for athletics, attending games, speaking to victorious teams, and soliciting funds from alumni and boards of trustees, while institutions began to provide money for teams, absorb their debts, and grant scholarships (55:231). College presidents often sided with the development of athletics rather than with faculty.

Early Attempts at Reform

In 1895, the next major attempt to establish order in the athletic programs began. The formation of conferences led to the development of rules and guidelines appropriate for athletics and resulted in more faculty control. The basic guidelines set the precedent for the NCAA. The guidelines prohibited gifts or remunerations for athletes, decreed that only bona fide undergraduates not delinquent in studies could compete, sidelined transfers for half a year before they could participate and outlawed participation by coaches (55:227).

The football program was the primary instigator necessitating the rule changes. Football was the dominate college sport in the 1890s. (Baseball was mainly a professional sport and basketball had not yet made its intercollegiate appearance.) Football evolved in the 1890s as a consumer-oriented sport. Stadiums were built enabling large groups of spectators to watch games. Spectators enjoyed watching close, action-packed games. Winning close and exciting games boosted the entertainment value of the games, pleasing spectators. But winning at all costs increased the roughness and sometimes even led to death.

To create an aura of excitement, football started developing mass-formation plays such as the "flying wedge." These plays were designed to give a team the winning edge by utilizing mass momentum. The results were brutal—18 players killed and 100 injured during the 1905 season. Because of the continued brutality, many schools dropped their football programs, and many others demanded that something be done about the situation. President Theodore Roosevelt became involved along with other influential people.

President Roosevelt, an avid football fan, was asked to bring together the three big football schools—Harvard, Yale and Princeton—to set down rules. It was assumed that if the leaders would set an example, other schools would follow (35:232). The President held a conference at the White House for football coaches, faculty, and alumni. The conference inadvertently promoted football by increasing the sport's visibility, but had little immediate effect on injuries or deaths from mass plays. After the death of a Union College football player, however, Henry McCraken pushed for a national meeting of the chief football teams, either to reform or to abolish the program. In December 1905, representatives of a number of colleges met at his invitation and decided to form a new rules committee. President Roosevelt urged the old committee of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton to combine with the McCraken group but the two groups opposed the combination and met separately at the same hotel. Then Harvard's representative, feeling he was getting nowhere, left his group to join the other's meeting. This move opened the door for mutual discussion, and the two groups finally came together to form the crux of the NCAA. Football, as we know it today, had its roots in their work.

The NCAA made its formal appearance in 1910 when members of the group that originally met with McCraken were contacted by numerous other institutions that wanted to be a part of the regulatory force. Two rule changes that revolutionized the game of football came out of the new legislation: 1) introduction of the forward pass, which opened up the game and led to fewer mass-formation plays; and 2) a change in the maximum number of men allowed on the line of scrimmage.

By 1917, football had become a large, revenue-producing spectacle, with winning still the paramount goal.

Basketball, on the other hand, did not make its college debut until 1915, even though the sport had existed for twenty-four years. Basketball developed because of the need for an indoor sport. There were plenty of outdoor sports—football, soccer, rugby, boating, tennis, golf, track, softball, and baseball—but there was a strong need for an activity to maintain fitness through the winter months. By World War I, basketball had become the second-most-popular sport after football and was played by both men and women.

Turn-of-the-Century Attitudes toward Sport

During the early 1900s, sport was viewed as an antidote for an overly civilized society. Theodore Roosevelt called his era the "period of strenuous life," and sometimes used the language of football to speak of the confident, aggressive America he hoped to inspire: "Hit the line hard; don't foul and don't shrink, but hit the line hard" (35:228).

Roosevelt also encouraged interest in virile, manly sports to counter questions about the nation's masculinity that were raised as the twentieth century began. It was a time of increased urbanization and industrialization, and there was some fear that an increase in the female role, for example, in the schools, had led to softness. Only struggle, competition, and the drive for success would restore masculinity (5:369).

The need to reinvigorate masculinity appeared to be a reaction against a society that had begun to turn its back on rugged individualism. Both the nation and sport were moving from a laissez faire system to one characterized by greater governmental or institutional control. The laissez faire system had led to domination by one company or team, i.e., monopoly. Monopolies created uneven competition in sport, causing the collapse of some teams. The entertainment value of sport deteriorated slightly as a result. Spectators went to athletic events to back a team with at least a real chance to win. Lopsided scores decreased spectator support until World War I.

Women's programs at this time differed from the men's in both competitiveness and basic philosophy. Women athletes' philosophy was to play, have fun, and socialize, encouraging the maximum amount of participation by as many people as possible (35:215). In the nineteenth century, when women first began to be active physically, many people thought that a woman's place was in the home. Until World War I, vigorous activity was condemned for women because of its supposedly harmful effect on sexuality and childbirth. Only with women's suffrage did they get a genuine opportunity to compete.

Sport and the World War I Effort

At the onset of World War I, collegiate sport retained its student-run aspect (35:282). Although the age-old antagonism between things of the flesh and things of mind and spirit still existed, faculty hostility toward athletics had dissipated somewhat. College administrators, alumni, students, and the public supported athletics, putting pressure on the faculty. Many felt that athletics gave identity to an institution and developed feelings of solidarity. As Lawrence Lowell, president of Harvard, said, "Such contests offer to students the one common interest, the only striking occasion for a display of college solidarity" (35:226). Rituals such as mass meetings, bonfires, rallies homecomings, colors, and bands became traditions that fused all the forces of an institution together behind the team (35:229).

Sport, teamwork, and striving for a common goal played a part in the World War I effort, because athletes helped train military personnel for battle. All sports were played at the military camps, but boxing proved to be the most popular. The army and the navy promoted intercamp competition, which led to the first interallied games in 1919. While troops were waiting to demobilize, sport was a means to occupy their time. Mass military games led to the Military Olympics. Overall, World War I stressed a higher claim for sport that soon was translated to the colleges.

The first major professional scandal arose in 1919, however, with the Chicago White Sox, blamed for throwing games. The scandal kindled investigations of sports rules compliance and spurred the NCAA to tighten the rules of collegiate athletics.

The 1920s were a golden age for sport. Intercollegiate athletics grew rapidly, fueled by an economic and technical boom and by women's suffrage. Increased newspaper coverage, the automobile, and the radio also fed the nation's appetite for sport; the automobiles made traveling to sporting events easier and radio and newspapers increased awareness of what local teams were doing (55:210). Attendance at sporting events rose dramatically. The three major sports at this time were football, boxing, and baseball, and basketball was just becoming popular. On campus, football and basketball were the focal points for student entertainment.

Sport finally had become an integral part of the educational system. Financially, intercollegiate athletics helped male athletes through scholarships, which gave rise to professional-style recruiting. Gallico credits Red Grange, a football coach, with starting the competition for football talent through that type of recruiting (55:214). Others' attempts to keep up resulted in a semipro recruiting model. One cynic called it "exchanging football ability into a coin realm" (48:154). Recruiting top athletes was of enormous commercial value, but it also opened the door to recruiting violations.

> Gallico aptly explained: In their frantic attempts to acquire similar attractions to Red Grange's the universities impaled themselves, front, back, and sideways on the horns of the dilemma that had been created—how to coax, lure, rent, hire, or buy football stars who would be drawing cards, while at the same time managing to keep their fingers off the swag. During this process they fractured amateur codes into so many pieces that no man has yet been able to put them together again. (55:214)

Other controversial subjects began to crop up—whether undergraduate sport should be used to entertain fellow students, alumni, faculty, and the public; whether women should be allowed to compete; whether women's athletics would fall into the same traps as the men's. Critics used these problems to condemn what they found wrong in American society at large. Social criticism came from a minority that did not indulge in sports or watch games. To them, sports indicated decadence—wealthy America had lost its soul and grown intellectually barren as society became mechanical, commercial, business oriented, and materialistic (35:317).

The assault on college sport was not new, but the volume of criticism was unprecedented (although it did not curtail spectator participation). Due to increased newspaper coverage and circulation, the bad news spread rapidly. Upton Sinclair wrote that "the masters of ancient Rome provided gladiatorial combats for the purpose of diverting the minds of the populace from the loss of their ancient liberties. And in the same way the masters of modern America provide gigantic struggles on the football field" (55:318).

In 1929, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching produced a three-year study of intercollegiate sport and its worth. The study produced these findings:

> 1) a change of values is needed in a field that is sodden with the commercial and the material and the vested interests that these forces have created. Commercialism in college athletics must be diminished and college sport must rise to a point where it is esteemed primarily and sincerely for the opportunities it affords to mature youth . . . to exercise at once the body and the mind and to foster habits both bodily health and . . . high qualities of character . . . . 2) The American college must review within itself the force that will challenge the best intellectual capabilities of the undergraduates. (55:216)

The report concluded rather naively that college presidents could change the policies permitting commercialized and professionalized athletics that boards of trustees had previously sanctioned. The presidents of the universities were not going to put an end to the profitable enterprise of athletics. The Carnegie report produced to suppress further commercialization of sport backfired and managed to foster the growth of sport. Colleges began to make larger provisions for all students to participate in athletics, even those who were not varsity material. Sport began to take off as a mass phenomenon, good for all Americans.

Sport for All

Women's sports already had adopted the philosophy of sport for all. Women's recognition in intercollegiate athletics started with the suffrage movement. In contrast to that of men's athletics, the philosophy of women's sport was anticompetitive. Women athletes believed that play should be for everyone, bringing "the greatest good to the greatest number" (35:353). They believed that competition was bad and led to numerous problems.

There were other important differences in the way that men's and women's athletics developed. Men's programs started in physical education departments but were transferred quickly to specialist coaches hired for each sport. Women's programs on the other hand, developed in physical education departments and remained there, until the passing of Title IX. The physical educators conducted women's sports via "play days"—large gatherings where participation, a variety of activities, and socialization were stressed. Many teams did not practice formally to prepare for play day; formal practices would have created an aura of competition that was tabu for women's programs at the time.

A few women, however, began to break into the competitive world of men's athletics, opening the door for the growth of women's sports. Gertrude Ederle was the first to prove that a woman could be as competitive as a man. The first woman to swim the English Channel, she broke the men's record. In the 1920s, women were allowed to compete in track at the Olympics, but because of their lack of proper training, many fainted before they reached the finish line. Consequently, women were not allowed to compete in the next Olympics.

In basketball, football, softball, and field hockey, women's sports began to parallel men's activities, without the commercialization associated with men's programs. The growth of intercollegiate athletics for women was still impeded, however, because sport was stereotyped as manly and competitive. Play days were still the rule for women's sports through the Depression and World War II.

The Depression Years

The Depression had a dramatic impact on both professional and intercollegiate athletics. Attendance at all athletic events dropped 30 to 40 percent, correlating with a 30 percent drop in the work force (35:263). Even with the fall in attendance, many schools did not abandon their football programs: This sport was still the most popular form of athletic entertainment. Many minor sports either were cancelled or their budgets were drastically reduced. Elite sports like golf and tennis were hit the hardest because of their expense.

In the early 1930s, the NCAA attempted to restructure recruiting rules. As a voluntary regulator, the NCAA had difficulty controlling college programs. There was a need to govern the big revenue earners—basketball and football—and to maintain educational integrity for athletes.

A shift in the content of physical education classes for men during the thirties tended to professionalize amateur athletes. The classes had begun to concentrate on preparing athletes for a particular sport. Emphasis on the well-balanced, general physical education program was placed on hold for several decades. Intramurals were created to satisfy the "sport for all" philosophy at a time when course selection in physical education was limited.

The 1930s also brought a demand for graduate work to develop coaches for particular sports (55:227). The new emphasis on preparing athletes in physical education also fostered the need for coaches trained in particular areas. Physical education instructors were being replaced by professionals trained for a particular sport, thus perpetuating the professionalization of intercollegiate athletics.

During the New Deal, the federal government became a promoter of sport and recreation. Under the new relief and recovery programs, billions of dollars were spent to construct athletic fields, rinks, parks, lakes, and other recreational facilities. Professional football also emerged in the mid-thirties.

By the end of the decade, the athletic entertainment industry was on the upswing. The public possessed time and money for sport involvement, and more sports were available both to spectators and participants. One further change had also taken place: the social upheaval of the twenties led to the development of sports clothes—another market for commercialization and promotion.

World War II and Its Aftermath

Many believed that World War II would dramatically affect athletics. Former athletes were called up to train soldiers once again, and many athletes of service age either were drafted or enlisted. But most sports survived during the war because Americans needed a winning attitude. Such an attitude would boost soldiers' morale and their desire for victory in battle. As in World War I, soldiers had many opportunities to participate in team sports, a factor that helped maintain troop solidarity.

After World War II, sport expanded at a rapid rate. The industry benefited from technological improvements in communications, air service, and sports equipment. Improved air service expanded competition, since teams could travel both farther and faster. Television brought sports into the home and became the primary vehicle for promotion. Technology produced new fabrics and athletic equipment that made games more exciting and visible. New sports were introduced as well. Athletes were better-trained and better-repared to participate while minimizing injuries.

In professional sports, the dominant component of postwar American athletics, advertisements on television and in newspapers and magazines became the key to financial success. Organized intercollegiate athletics usually copied the professional promotional tactics (basketball had made its professional debut in 1953). In the process, intercollegiate athletics ran up against a new set of problems as social mobility through sport became the rule. Collegiate athletes had a better chance to make professional teams. When that happened, it brought prestige to their institutions. But recruiting athletes became more competitive. To attract top athletes, colleges needed both a history of winning and a high professional drafting ratio. Unfortunately, education seemed to come third on the recruitment priority list.

The end of World War II had brought a large influx of GI's to American campuses, increasing the pool of potential athletes, which had shrunk during the war. Small colleges began to restore defunct athletic programs, and big-time college programs also grew. Both football and basketball made college athletics big business. The games provided money to perpetuate athletics, build new facilities, and support budgets. But institutions still faced the same vicious circle: "The pressure to win, in order to sell tickets, to meet expenses necessary to recruit athletes, which were required in order to win, produced a climate conducive to cheating, scandal and hypocrisy" (55:348).

With its credibility already wavering, collegiate sport faced its most serious crisis—gambling in basketball. The first case surfaced in 1945, when a team was caught shaving points to keep the spread margin down. The worst incident, however, was in 1951, when a major gambling scandal involving thirty players and seven schools came to light. The schools had conspired to fix games (although

coaches all denied any knowledge of the incident). All indicted players were permanently banned from professional basketball. There were other cases of point shaving in 1961 and 1965, and, most recently, in 1985 at Tulane University.

During the 1960s and early 1970s, both the civil rights and the women's movements began to have a great impact on sport. Since blacks had fought side by side with whites in the war, they wanted the right to participate as equals in intercollegiate athletics and professional sports (35:344). Women had done men's jobs during the war and felt that they deserved an opportunity to participate in athletics as well. Both blacks and women had proved they could handle stress and competition.

International competition increased during the post war years because of faster travel. The stage was set for a second golden age of sport. A prosperous economy fostered more participation in sport, and both intercollegiate and professional athletics had become more widely accepted.

The Scene in the Seventies

At some institutions, the 1970s were a time of success and plenty, but for others, the decade was a period of virtual famine where money for sports programs was concerned. The country was in a recession, and colleges' operating funds shrank. Once again, minor sports were hit the hardest. Some colleges dropped their football programs; others raised ticket prices; and still others dropped the smaller sports or reduced grants, recruiting budgets, and travel expenses. To help institutions curtail expenses, the NCAA made restrictions on the number of full grant-in-aid athletic scholarships available per sport, as well as on amount of spending money players could receive in addition to their scholarship.

In the midst of the athletic program reductions, women's intercollegiate athletics soared with the passage of Title IX. The first intercollegiate athletic event for women, a golf tournament, had been held in the forties at Ohio State. Title IX called for equality of opportunity for women athletes, and for equal facilities, practice time, coaching, and travel (35:382). For the first time, women were allowed to receive athletic scholarships. Women became highly skilled and trained athletes, and spectators soon began taking an interest in their sports events.

Colleges where sport was big business received an influx of money in the seventies. Television, with its lucrative contracts, had revolutionized athletics. By 1970, all three major networks were televising either college or professional games. The commercialization of sport was so successful that stadiums would be filled while thousands were watching on television. Although some schools lost fans as professional football and basketball expanded to more and more cities, others watched their gate receipts increase. Some institutions that were profiting from sports still encountered problems. The need to recruit more winning players for their teams led some into abuses, including doctored student transcripts and illegal financing.

A New NCAA Role

Because of repeated violations, the NCAA found it necessary to assume a new role in enforcement. In the past, the organization had set rules and regulations, but had not carried out sanctions efficiently. Basically, it warned institutions that rule infractions had occurred. The NCAA developed new rules called the principles of conduct, which stressed five areas: amateurism, institutional control and responsibility, sound academic standards, financial-aid government, and rules governing recruiting. The rules were a step in the right direction. In 1973 the NCAA reorganized the divisions to which member schools belonged, hoping to control infractions by putting like institutions together in terms of size, enrollment, and money spent. Competing schools would be on a more equal footing, a step thought to benefit small institutions.

Another NCAA rule change affected coaches. In 1976, the regulatory organization strengthened its enforcement arm and began to institute penalties against schools that violated rules. Penalties, however, were imposed on the schools, not on coaches. A guilty penalty took effect. Now penalties follow coaches to their jobs. In addition, the NCAA now enforces punishments according to the level of the infraction—gross, minor or premeditated.

New rules have also been proposed to reduce the number of scholarships that schools can award and to utilize the "Robin Hood" theory of distribution—money from television contracts would be distributed to all teams, not just to those holding contracts. The NCAA negotiates television contracts for all schools, keeping a small percentage of the money for itself (12:44).

Despite new rules regulating coaches, athletic departments, and institutions, it is difficult for the NCAA to keep up with infractions because the money and prestige associated with having a winning team are a great source of temptation. One coach told an NCAA representative, "While you're out making new rules, we the coaches are meeting at a hotel up the street trying to figure how to get around them" (12:44).

Contemporary Issues in Intercollegiate Sports

Problems and tensions threatening the stability of intercollegiate athletics today come from many sources. Current issues include crowd behavior, racial grievance, monetary problems, drug abuse, educational accountability, internal ferment among participants and coaches, the behavior of coaches, and the policies of athletic departments (14:403). The drug abuse situation has presented a new challenge for institutions. Balancing academic learning with athletics has posed an ever more serious dilemma, as coaches have recruited star athletes from lower socioeconomic levels; some players cannot cope with the academic demands of college.

Another contemporary problem concerns the often-authoritarian methods of coaches. Under pressure to win, they sometimes treat players with a sort of Machiavellianism "associated with emotional detachment in interpersonal relations, a tending to exploit situations and others for self-gain, and a tendency to take over control in smaller groups" (52:189). Some authorities believe that many problems in sport are attributable to this Machiavellian behavior (54:208).

Coaches also tend to value loyalty to tradition, respect, and obedience to established authority. Their beliefs about their own authority can create conflicts with athletes, who must follow orders because of their scholarship obligations. Coaches' values can cause an "insurgent coercive" relationship (54:226). Athletes suffer in trying to remain loyal to the coach, especially if they are asked to do something illegal or unethical in order to win. Some coaches feel that cheating is the only road to survival today (61:14).

Another major problem involves recruiting. There is far too much pressure for a seventeen-year-old to make a wise educational choice while coaches—or boosters and alumnk—are waving cash, cars, favors, and promises in his face.

Furthermore, the athletes recruited are not always the best students academically. Coaches recruit students who have substandard academic qualifications; nevertheless, these student-athletes are expected to remain eligible and graduate. To survive, the student is either placed in "crib" (easy) courses or he/she cheats on exams in regular classes. During recruitment, academically weak superstar athletes are made numerous promises—that they will get an education, a chance for social upward mobility, or exposure to professional scouts. The sad truth is that many athletes do not graduate. They are somehow kept eligible for four years and then discarded to fend for themselves.

To compound the problem, colleges now recruit many young athletes from urban, low-socioeconomic-level families. Athletic programs represent a vehicle for upward mobility, especially for those not likely to attend college, and thus foster educational goals. Professor Luscher found that upwardly mobile athletes possess leadership qualities (34:256). Athletes attend college both to get ready to go professional in sports and to develop attitudes and behavioral patterns acceptable in the larger occupational world.

While intercollegiate athletics gives these young athletes a chance for social mobility, it also exposes them to opportunities to opportunities to make a fast buck through bribes and gambling. Because these students and their families are usually poor, it can be hard for them to resist temptation, and too often, cash is readily available in exchange for small favors, such as point shaving.

The Tulane incident confirms this view of the low-socioeconomic-status athlete's problems. Tulane University is a private institution with many well-to-do students. When low-socioeconomic-status athletes come into this situation, they are put under pressure to keep up with other students, whether or not they can afford it. Even if the student-athlete is awarded a full ride—room, board,

books, tuition and fees paid, but no spending money—he/she is not allowed to work to earn extra income. Until recently, athletes on full rides could qualify for a nine-hundred-dollar Pell Grant for spending money, but that does not go far at a school like Tulane.

When opportunity knocks in the form of dollars, changes are good that some athletes, handicapped both educationally and economically, will succumb. The irony of the Tulane incident was that while many deplored cheating by a star, few noticed that when the star was shown a printed copy of his rights, he had difficulty reading it.

In the past few years, the NCAA has made numerous rule changes in behalf of the *student*-athlete. At present, to remain eligible, college athletes must make normal progress toward a degree each semester, passing a minimum of twenty-four semester credits each year. This rule has reduced the number of "crib" courses athletes can take.

Another proposed rule change—Proposition 48, affecting secondary school athletes—comes up for a vote at the NCAA in January 1985. Under its provisions, high school athletes will have to maintain a 2.0 average in eleven core courses and receive a minimum score of 700 on the SAT's or 15 on the ACT's. Some blacks have argued against the rule change on the grounds that standardized tests discriminate against students of their race and will hurt young blacks in the long run. But a strong case has also been made that if high school athletes can become better prepared before entering college, they will fare better educationally, and the tendency to cheat will be reduced.

Some colleges are also trying to help underprepared student-athletes through academic support groups, such as those at George Mason University and Georgetown University. The support groups were developed to help give student-athletes academic help so that they can graduate. The programs assist all athletes by ensuring that they make normal progress, by placing them in special educational programs if necessary, and by providing tutors and moral support. In addition, the groups emphasize that student-athletes are students first and, athletes second.

An additional issue in contemporary college sports concerns control of athletics programs. To a great extent, colleges and universities no longer control athletics. These institutions voluntarily gave up some of their control to the NCAA, but there are financial reasons for the shift in control as well. Schools must spend money to make money in athletics: the business is somewhat speculative. Yet, the financial structure of athletics precludes planning decisions based on future interest in participation and entertainment value (5:371). With television, moreover, institutions no longer can control commercialization.

Today, power is so widely diffused outside colleges and universities that an institution must strive to become a major shareholder of its own athletic material. To regain control, institutions might consider such steps as stabilizing their budgets, involving their chief executive officers in the effort, and allowing student-athletes a share making decision that affect them (through athletic councils, for example). Institutional governing bodies should create rules that benefit education, protecting the health and welfare of students and fair competition, limiting the media and, perhaps, the number of required conference games. Finally, athletic programs should be included in the normal accreditation processes of the college or university to ensure that its educational mission is upheld (25:411-19).

Furthermore, university presidents should become more academically involved, for example, by attending NCAA meetings. Presidents must participate in the process of reviewing and instituting rules and guidelines that apply to their institutions. Responding to the gambling incident at Tulane, President Kelley chose to ban the basketball program there. According to the *Tulanian,* Kelly believes that his decision will "send a message loud and clear to our other university presidents nationwide" (60:8). There are those who believe that Kelly's solution was only a bandaid for a much larger problem; abolishing a program is only a temporary solution at best.

The Outlook for the Future

Finding long-range solutions demands some understanding of what the future holds for athletics. A Commission of Collegiate Athletics study projects trends to the year 2000, when demographic changes will have altered the campus community significantly. Overall, there will be fewer traditional eighteen- to twenty-four-year old students, while the number of female and minority students will increase (15:499). There will be more part-time students, especially at two-year schools. College stu-

dents will be older. In addition, the number of full-time students enrolled at four-year institutions will probably decline. On the basis of these enrollment changes, it has been predicted, the traditionally active sports areas at four-year colleges will also decline (15:500).

Respondents to the Commission of Collegiate Athletics survey rejected the idea that athletic costs would continue to outpace inflation at a time when traditional enrollments were dropping. While expenses for some individual sports or types of equipment may escalate, the costs of the program as a whole probably will not. The shift in athletics will be from "product orientation to market orientation." If a sport sells, it will be produced, and in some instances, this change has already taken place (15:502). Since older students may be more apt to attend events than to participate in them, gate receipts may actually increase. Moreover, the expected growth in female enrollment will stimulate participation in women's athletics. Since women's programs are not primary revenue producers, the overall athletic budget likely will be strained.

Other changes in society will deal with personal values and personal participation. Today, people are generally more aware of their own bodies and personal health than in the past, and this attitude may create a trend toward old-fashioned individualism. Loyalties to large-scale teams will probably weaken and family-oriented activities may increase. With more individual sports and spectators, there may be less awareness of the "jock" image. Hopefully, this image will be replaced by a sincere belief that physical activity is vital for good health and a proper mental attitude (15:505).

Possible changes also may be seen in patterns of institutional sports and their regulations. The outlook points to more individual spprts, but fewer major intercollegiate athletic programs. Football and men's and women's basketball will most likely continue to do well, drawing large audiences despite the trend away from mass-team sports. How women's sports will evolve remains unclear.

What types of regulations may be imposed in the future? One possibility is that the government may become involved if the NCAA does not prove more successful in keeping athletic programs in check. The government might lessen the student-athlete's freedom of choice by concentrating on only a few highly organized sports. A "tsar" might preside over intercollegiate athletics. External interference would probably come about through governmental legislation or association input (5:508).

In any case, regulation of athletics programs will remain an important issue. "Unless we tighten our academic standards, reduce the intensity of recruiting, incorporate messages and performance standards other than winning into the employment conditions of coaching, or get serious about regulations, and college presidents assert leadership roles in the NCAA, then the present quasi-regulatory structure will become hollow and a thoroughly hypocritical shell housing a lawless jungle" (4:16).

Television will continue to have an enormous effect on athletics, and some colleges may even begin to recruit athletes overtly through this medium. Since television time is expensive, only wealthy schools could afford to use this means of recruiting.

Financial problems will probably continue for many schools, especially if the costs of athletic programs keep rising. Dan Canham, athletic director at the University of Michigan, has warned that "if the trend of higher expenditures continues, only the biggest programs will survive and a super conference will develop out of the wreckage" (40:64).

Some have proposed that athletics be divorced from academics. If football and basketball teams were allowed to break away and become minor league franchises, then athletes would be disassociated from educational institutions altogether and could drop the pretense of amateurism.

Finally, the fundamental psychological and sociological values of athletics generally will remain unchallenged. Although the types of sports may change, interest will continue. In spite of enormous problems today, intercollegiate athletics will be a vigorous part of American life in the year 2000 and will still be worthwhile (15:509).

Bibliography

1. "A Few Coaches 'Cheat Out of Fear of Losing Their Jobs.' " *U.S. News & World Report*, 1 July 1985, p. 62-65.

2. American Council on Education. "Responsibilities in the Conduct of Collegiate Athletic Programs." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):345-350.

3. Andreano, Ralph. "Money and the Folk Hero." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 164-174.

4. Atwell, Robert H. "Keeping the Amateur in Athletics," *Educational Record* 64, no. 2 (Sum. 1983):16-19.

5. Atwell, Robert H. "Some Reflections on Collegiate Athletics." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979): 367-373.

6. Axthelm, Pete. "The Sickness of College Sports." *Newsweek*, 22 April 1985, p. 74.

7. Beisser, Arnold. "Modern Man and Sports." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 235-245. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

8. Boyle, Robert H. "An Ethological Theory of Play." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 42-53. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

9. Browne, Evelyn. "An Ethological Theory of Play." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 368-375. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

10. Cady, Edwin. "The Big Game: College Sports and American Life." *Journal of Higher Education* 51, no. 3 (1980):339-340.

11. Caillois, Roger. "Toward a Sociology Derived from Games." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 361-368. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

12. Cole, Lewis. "The NCAA: Mass Culture as Big Business." *Change* 8, 8 (Sept. 1976):42-46.

13. Cozens, Frederick, and Stumpf, Florence. "The Role of the School in the Sports Life of America." pp. 56-83. In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

14. Crase, Darnell. "Athletes in Trouble." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 402-407. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

15. Dickason, Donald G. "The Future of Collegiate Athletics." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):499-509.

16. Durso, Joseph. "The Sports Factory: An Investigation into Collegiate Sports." *Journal of Higher Education* 51, no. 3 (1980):361-362.

17. Edwards, Harry. "The Black 'Dumb Jock'—An American Sports Tragedy." *The College Board Review*, no. 131 (Spr. 1984):8-13.

18. Eells, Walter C. "Criticisms of Higher Education: Picturesque Exaggerations Found in Current Writings." *Journal of Higher Education* 50, no. 4 (1979):398-340.

19. El Khawas, Elaine. "Self-Regulation and Collegiate Athletics." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979): 510-517.

20. Flath, Arnold W. "A History of Relations Between the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the American Athletic Union of the United States (1905-1963)." Ph.D. dissertation, Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Physical University Microfilms, 1963.

21. Francois, Denise. "Bibliography on Collegiate Athletics." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):512-534.

22. Gallico, Paul. "The Last Stronghold of Hypocrisy." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 111-120. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley, Co., 1974.

23. Gerber, Ellem W. "The Legal Basis for the Regulation of Intercollegiate Sport." *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 56, no. 2 (1985): 467-481.

24. Glader, Eugene A. *Amateurism and Athletics*, Leisure Press, 1978, p. 81.

25. Grant, Christine H. B. "Institutional Autonomy and Intercollegiate Athletics." *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 56, no. 2 (1985):409-419.

26. Hanford, George H. "Controversies in College Sport." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):351-366.

27. Huizinga, Johan. "Play and Contest as Civilizing Functions." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 333-359. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

28. "It's Cleanup Time for Sports." *U.S. News & World Report*, 1 July 1985, pp. 62-65.

29. Johnson, Roy S. "S.M.U. Attempts to Offset Penalties." *New York Times*, 25 Aug. 1985, pp. 5-11.

30. Kidd, Thomas R., and Mendall, Ron. "Organized Athletics as a Leisure Delivery System." *Journal of Physical Education and Recreation* 51, no. 4 (Apr. 1980):59-60.

31. Lakie, William L. "Personality Characteristics of Certain Groups of Athletes." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 208-216. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

32. Lopiano, Donna G. "Solving the Financial Crisis in Intercollegiate Athletics." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):394-407.

33. Lowell, Cym H. "The Law and Collegiate Athletics in Public Institutions." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):482-498.

34. Loy, John W. "The Study of Sport and Social Mobility." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 249-268. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

35. Lucas, John A., and Smith, Ronald A. *Saga of American Sport*. Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1978.

36. Maheu, Rene. "Sport and Culture." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 386-397. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

37. Mantel, Richard C., and Velden, Lee V. "The Relationship Between the Professionalization of Attitude Toward Play of Pre-adolescent Boys and Participation in Organized Sport." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 172-178. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

38. Nelson, Eileen S. "How the Myth of Dumb Jock Becomes Fact: A Developmental View for Counselors." *Counseling and Values* 27, no. 3 (April 1983):176-185.

39. Nyquist, Ewald B. "Win, Women, Money: Collegiate Athletics Today and Tomorrow." *Educational Record* 60, no. 4 (Fall 1979):374-393.

40. Odenkirk, James E. "Intercollegiate Athletics: Big Business or Sport." *Academe: Bulletin AAUP* 67, no. 2 (Apr. 1981):62-66.

41. Ogilvie, Bruce, and Tutko, Thomas. "Success Phobia." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 217-245. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

42. Orleans, Jeffery H. "Aggressive Pursuit of a Legislative Exemption Under Title IX for Revenue-Producing Men's Sports Is Not in the Best Interests of Athletes or Colleges." *Educational Record* 63, no. 1 (Win. 1982):41-45.

43. Paxson, Frederic L. "The Rise of Sport." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 80-103. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

44. Phillips, John C., and Schafer, Walter E. "Consequences of Participation in Interscholastic Sports: A Review and Prospectus." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 467-475. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

45. Rhatigan, J. "Serving Two Masters: The Plight of the College Student-Athlete." *NASPA Journal* 22, no. 1 (Sum. 1983):16-19.

46. Rehberg, Richard A., and Schafer, Walter E. "Participation in Interscholastic Athletics and College Expectations." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 98-110. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

47. Roberts, John M., Arth, Malcolm, Bush, Robert R. "Games on Culture." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 376-385. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

48. Sage, George. "The Socio-Economic Dimension of Sport." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 154-156. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

49. Sage, George. "An Assessment of Personality Profiles Between and Within Intercollegiate Athletes from Eight Different Sports." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 179-186. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

50. Sage, George. "The Coach as Management: Organizational Leadership in American Sport." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 429-475. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

51. Sage, George. "Humanistic Theory: The Counter Culture and Sport: Implications for Action and Research." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 415-427. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

52. Sage, George. "Machiavellianism Among College and High School Coaches." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 188-207. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

53. Sage, George. "Sport and Society." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 330-332. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1971.

54. Sage, George. "Value Orientations of American College Coaches Compared to Those of Male College Students and Businessmen." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 207-228. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

55. Spears, Betty, and Swanson, Richard A. *History of Sport and Physical Activity in the United States*. William C. Brown Co., 1978.

56. Stern, Barry E. "The Cultural Crisis in American Sports." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 408-415.

57. Stone, Gregory P. "Some Meanings of American Sport." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 398-422. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1970.

58. Struna, Nancy. "In 'Glorious Disarray': The Literature of American Sport History." *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 56, no. 2, 1985.

59. Snyder, Eldon E. "High School Athletics and Their Coaches: Educational Plans and Advice." In *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings*, pp. 476-489. University of Northern Colorado: Addison-Wesley Co., 1974.

60. "The Post Game Wrap-up." *Tulanian* (Sum. 1985):6-9.

61. Uehling, Barbara. "Athletics and Academe: Creative Divorce or Reconciliation?" *Educational Record* 64, no. 3 (Sum. 1983):13-15.

62. Westby, David L., and Sack, Allen. "The Commercialization and Functional Rationalization of College Football." *Journal of Higher Education* 47, no. 6 (Nov.-Dec. 1976):625-647.

Chapter IV

Cheating in College Sports: A Qualitative Assessment

by
Eleanor Gerber
J. Wade Gilley

Introduction

What conditions lead a university sports program to cheat? What kinds of actors are involved, and what are their various contributions to the problem and its solution? How do universities react when faced with investigations of their ethical practices in sports?

In order to shed some light on these questions, a series of five case studies of college sports programs were undertaken. They were taken entirely from published sources. Using newspaper reports, magazines, and books, the history of each NCAA Division I program was sketched, extending back to 1975. Both football and basketball programs were included.

The case studies include three schools which have undergone major sports scandals in the recent past. It was necessary to select major scandals, even if they might not represent the experiences of the "average" cheater. Only cases which had stimulated major journalistic interest were complete enough for our purposes. Two cases involved NCAA enforcement. One did not.

In addition, two schools were selected as comparisons. These schools ran large, well-funded programs, but maintained both generally winning records and a reputation for honesty.

Both sets of cases include schools in the Southeast and Midwest, and public and private institutions.

The sample is quite small, and it was necessary to concentrate on institutions for which the record was relatively complete. For these reasons, it would be impossible to claim that the institutions described here are typical of American universities with regard to the administration of sports. They tend, rather, to represent the extremes: we have compared several institutions whose flagrant abuses came to light with others whose probity is legendary.

This qualitative data is useful, however, in elucidating the underlying processes which help to create cheating in college sports. The insights gained from a detailed examination of particular instances will be useful in defining the nature of the problem and in pointing out fruitful areas for further research.

Three categories of abuses were found to be important in our cases. These were recruiting, the miseducation of athletes, and drugs.

Recruiting Abuses and Illegal Compensation. Perhaps the most serious forms of cheating in college sports involve recruiting practices. A set of complex NCAA rules defines the legal process of recruiting. These rules are intended to ensure that recuirts are not pressured or given extra inducements to sign with particular schools. However, cheating in recruiting is thought to occur frequently, because a team's success depends on its ability to attract highly talented players. Such talented high school athletes may find themselves being offered inducements by several schools. Highly recruited high school athletes are called "blue chip" players, and the process of recruiting them is sometimes called "running a program on" the athlete.

In legal recruiting it is against the rules even to give a recruit a school banner or buy him a cheeseburger; it is also illegal to pay for a prospective athlete's visit to the campus. Ideally, therefore, the coach or members of his staff visit the athlete and his family and attempt to convey to them the advantages of playing with that team. But some coaches feel this is not enough, especially when the "blue" chipper" is being simultaneously recruited by a number of schools. If a coach decides it is worth cheating to bring a player in, the "program" becomes an orchestrated attempt to convince the student to sign his letter of intent.

Winning over the athlete's family can be very important. The athletes, of course, are all very young. One coach remarked that it is as important to recruit the athlete's mother as is the athlete himself. In our cases, this took the form of entertaining the family lavishly, and providing them with trips and accommodations. When the family is poor, they may be offered financial help of various kinds through booster donated money. Jobs, building contracts, and especially good deals on cars have been mentioned.

Coaches may attempt to ensure that the athlete is not alone on campus. They are reported to have arranged scholarships for the athlete's best friend, girlfriend, or sibling. Scholarships have been provided to high school classmates to agree to keep the coach posted on the activities of recruiters from other schools, and the daily shifts of mood of the blue-chipper himself. One such spy was given a four year scholarship as equipment manager for the team. Perhaps the crude attempt to one coach to convince black recruits that an enjoyable social life awaited them on an all-white, recently integrated, campus might be included here. The coach sent cars to local high schools to round up black teenagers to stage a phoney "fraternity dance" in a rented hall whenever black recruits were on campus.

Of course, the ultimate inducements are cash payments to players. The executive director of the NCAA, Walter Byers, has stated that these payments probably occur quite frequently. Several years ago, a coach of a major basketball team suggested that $10,000 might be standard for a basketball player, and $25,000 might be standard for a top football player. Professional players occasionally talk about the money they received during college. Nevertheless, it is difficult to find published accounts of institutions where the NCAA managed to prove large payments of this kind. Perhaps some schools have managed to keep the details of such abuses from becoming common knowledge. Since the NCAA does not publish the details of its charges, some schools may be able to control publicity about payments to athletes. Another possibility exists: it may be difficult for the NCAA to prove payments in large amounts. Such payments probably originate with boosters, who are under no obligation to cooperate with NCAA investigators; the money they provide may be efficiently laundered precisely because the amounts are so large. As a result, the NCAA may suspect more than it can prove.

And in fact, the largest payments which occurred in our cases were not uncovered by the NCAA. In one instance, a large booster-originated payment was revealed in the course of a police investigation into another matter. In another, a professional athlete talked about what he had received in college.

It should be remembered that the NCAA's investigative powers are only those of a self-regulating membership organization. It cannot subpoena evidence, has little control over private individuals, and yet must adhere to high standards of proof in its charges. Suspected large payments may therefore not appear in formal charges because adequate proof is not available.

The level of support given to athletes while they are on scholarship is another area in which cheating frequently occurs. The NCAA mandates what it thought to be a very minimal level of support,

one which does not take into consideration the young athlete's needs for entertainment or independence. The various means which are used to slip scholarship athletes extra cash therefore form an important category of cheating. Many have been used: sale of athletes' complimentary tickets for inflated prices to cooperative boosters, provision of phoney jobs, and straight cash payments from illegal slush funds are just a few.

Comparison Schools: The most important factor which distinguishes our comparison schools from those in which ethical difficulties arise is that they have a long tradition of athletic excellence. In both instances, this tradition achieves what amounts to mythic proportions: these schools point to a history of great coaches and heroic players; they have been widely publicized winners for many years. It has been suggested that the existence of this kind of tradition is an important element in the school's ability to maintain ethical standards. This is particularly true in recruiting. Because of their national reputations, they are able to attract athletes from a wide region, and will have a better chance to recruit excellent players than schools which are less known, or are thought to have second rate teams. In fact, athletes report having "dreamed" of playing for our comparison schools. Illegal inducements may therefore be unnecessary.

Athletes who have been recruited by cheaters and non-cheaters simultaneously sometimes find the mercenary character of the illegal offers very off-putting. They may feel demeaned, as though they are being purchased, and report preferring the personal, fatherly, low-key approach which coaches in our comparison schools take. The coach's apparent concern for this team's academic and personal welfare, and the promise of a strong relationship with him, seem to be the most important recruiting techniques these schools have.

Academic Abuses: Recently, considerable attention has been paid to ethical abuses which involve the education of athletes. These fall into three major categories: 1. admission of unqualified athletes and the altering of their records; 2. miseducation of athletes; and 3. low graduation rates for some athletes.

In many cases, schools have admitted athletes whose academic qualifications are far below what is normally required for admission. The athlete's combined SAT score may be as low as 400. There are questions about the validity of even such low scores, however, particularly where the testing is done by the athletic department itself. In one instance, an athlete who scored 400 on the SAT recalled that he had been unable to read the verbal part of the exam. He told this to the assistant coach who was administering the test. An hour later, the coach returned with the good news: "Congratulations, you passed."

Various administrative devices are used to admit athletes who would not otherwise be considered qualified. In some cases, the athletic department simply handles its own admissions. In others, the regular admissions process is used, but "athletic talent" or the recommendation of the coach is given special weight. More common, however, is the use of special programs to admit athletes. Frequently, these are special remedial programs, intended as part of the university's attempt to increase minority enrollment. Another device we found was to admit athletes to a division of the university designed primarily for non-matriculated, part-time students.

Various subterfuges are used to maintain the athlete's eligibility to play. Perhaps the most serious, from the educational point of view, is placing athletes in easy courses with much content, some of which can be repeated again and again. Such courses may, in fact, be taught by athletic department personnel. Remedial reading courses, orientation courses, military science courses, and simple agriculture courses like "dairy science" have been used. Other courses involve athletic skills, like weight training and golf. Many athletes never proceed as far as selecting a major. Athletic department advisors may simply attempt to find the athlete enough passing credits to maintain his eligibility to play. As a result, many athletes make almost no progress towards a degree during their five years of eligibility.

Sometimes even these practices fail to maintain a student's eligibility to play. This may result in attempts to falsify the athlete's record. Pressure is put on professors to change grades; students are retroactively given credit for courses, or are dropped from courses which they have failed, without the professor's knowledge. These practices sometimes suggest cooperation from the registrar or other administrators. In our cases, when such charges have been made, the administration has denied knowledge of irregular manipulation of grades. The problem has been ascribed instead to simple clerical

error or administrative "sloppiness." In one case, however, it is clear that the administration had tolerated such abuses, and attempted to cover them up when they came to light.

The practices described above undoubtedly contribute to low graduation rates for athletes in certain programs. A 1981 NCAA study found that football players have the same graduation rates as college students generally. This is ascribed to superior counseling and support services for athletes. However, the comparison made in this study may be somewhat misleading. Athletes frequently exhaust 5 years of eligibility before dropping out. Thus, the proper comparison should be the graduation rates of athletes and non-athletes with 4 or more years in schools. How many non-athletes drop out after 4 years?

Our cases also indicate that graduation rates may be different for black and white players. For example, one major football team showed about an average graduation rate in a certain year, but this rate combined worse-than-average statistics for black players with quite good graduation rates for white athletes.

Comparison Schools: Both of the comparison schools had excellent graduation rates for athletes; one twice received an award from the CFA for having the best rate in the nation. Coaches and administrators in both institutions proudly remind reporters of ex-athletes now succeeding in the professions and business.

In one comparison school, there are no special classes for athletes, no use of remedial programs to maintain eligibility, and no major in physical education. Athletes live in the same dormitories as other students and apparently mingle freely in campus life. The administrators of this school insist on the priority of academics. If there is a conflict between a class and practice, it is the coach who is supposed to yield.

Some exceptions in admissions standards for talented athletes may be made, but these are carefully monitored. School authorities maintain that exceptions are infrequent and represent only minor deviations from university-wide standards.

It can be argued once again that the national reputation of these schools has an effect on the academic situation. They may be able to recruit athletes who are academically stronger than other schools can.

Drugs: Recently, there has been increasing concern about the use of drugs by college athletes. The use of illegal recreational drugs is not, however, clearly associated with the kinds of ethical abuses described above. Student athletes have been caught using drugs in programs which have a reputation for being honest as well as those with long histories of breaking NCAA rules.

Recently, however, a case occurred in which student drug use had severe consequences for the athletic program. A star player's taste for cocaine was used by other students to involve him in a point shaving scheme. When police began to interrogate players, recruiting and educational abuses came to light. The result was the cancellation of the entire program.

Drug use, therefore, has serious potential consequences for athletic programs which do cheat. Police and district attorneys have investigative powers which the NCAA does not possess, and (unlike the NCAA) they may not hesitate to create negative publicity for the school.

Schools have attempted to prevent drug use among their players by various means. Information programs, frequently including intentionally frightening lectures by law officers, are common. In one school, a consulting firm was hired to manage an information and counseling program in the wake of a drug related scandal in the athletic department.

College sports programs may also become involved with the use of prescription drugs designed to improve athletes' performance. These include anabolic steroids and anti-inflammatory drugs like phenylbutazoladine. These drugs were widely used in one of our case schools. They were distributed by several assistant coaches who illegally obtained them from coaches at another university. The original source was a pharmacist who was an avid sports fan. Athletes in all sports, not just football and basketball, were involved. Everyone claimed that there was no pressure on athletes to use these drugs. Eventually, after an intensive police investigation, the assistant coaches were fired and pleaded guilty to misdemeanor charges in court. There was apparently an attempt to hold the athletic director as responsible for the situation, as part of a political struggle to reduce his powers. But no evidence ever became public that he knew about or condoned the drug use.

Comparison Schools: Only in one not very well publicized instance was drug use connected with the comparison schools. Five athletes were dropped from the team because of drugs.

Underlying Processes

Perhaps the most revealing aspect of these case studies is the glimpse they give behind the scenes, of the conditions which allow cheating to flourish. In the subsequent analysis, cheating is treated as a systemic phenomenon, in which a wide range of processes must be taken into account. University politics, the attempt to gain and protect prestige, beliefs about the nature of cheating, and the existence of personal bonds of loyalty within the institution have all been found to be relevant. It is our belief that further studies of cheating in college sports should go beyond a simple deviance model, in which the essential cause of cheating is thought to be the individual decisions of morally deficient persons. Such individual decisions take place within the context of an institutional atmosphere in which cheating is regarded as acceptable or necessary. These influences must be examined if the phenomenon of cheating in college sports is to be understood.

Competitive Pressure: Many commentators have recently discussed the existence of a highly competitive atmosphere in college sports, the "win at all costs" attitude. This is often connected with the increasing amounts of money involved in running "big time" sports programs. Cheating is seen as an attempt to protect the athletic department's investment and earning potential.

Many large athletic programs have had debts in recent years, as a result of the expansion of facilities and lower than expected revenues from television. Such debts may contribute to the pressure to cheat in some cases. But in other cases, cheating has existed in programs which are among the wealthiest in the country. This leads us to question the direct causal connection between money and cheating: if earnings are all that is involved, why should wealthy programs cheat?

Two of our schools became involved in major cheating: one was rich, the other initially in debt. What they seemed to have in common was a dissatisfaction with their standing in their leagues. In both cases, serious cheating began after a decision was taken that it was necessary to improve their positions. They decided to achieve a better win-loss record, to gain a coveted title or to get an elusive invitation to a prestigious post-season game. It is frequently assumed that a second rate team can only attract first rate athletes by offering illegal inducements.

Why should the prestige of a title or a bowl game mean so much? Of course, winning is a much valued American goal. In our cases, considerable fan and booster pressure probably contributed to intensifying the coach's own self-generated urge to excel. Institutional pressures for such marks of athletic prestige also exist. In state run schools, for example, athletic prestige may be an important basis for the institution's support among the voters. Citizens unfamiliar or unsympathetic with the goals of higher education may come to approve of the university largely because of its teams. University presidents are sometimes explicit about this function: they describe athletics as "building bridges" to the people of the state, for example. Athletic prestige is a major means for the university to create a constituency in the community at large.

Another attitude connects competitive pressure with cheating. Some coaches believe that their competitors cheat on such a grand scale that they must provide their players with at least minimal illegal benefits, just to avoid being unfair. One of our cases showed cheating of this nature. The illegal payments which the coach gave to players were apparently quite small, and some were said to have come directly from his own pocket. This cheating can be seen as an act of loyalty between the coach and his team: the coach wants to help players who have "sacrificed" for him by not accepting bigger bribes elsewhere.

These attempts to improve competitive position occur in an atmosphere in which more and more coaches, fans and players believe in the necessity of cheating. Walter Byers recently commented on this. He indicated that as many as 30% of all schools may be involved in some level of cheating, and said that for some, probation had become nothing more than "the price of doing business."

A common justification for cheating is found in the idea that the rules which govern college sports are arbitrary and over-rigid. Adherents of this opinion point out that many of the things which the NCAA prohibits used to be perfectly acceptable practices. This there is a widespread belief that

there is no intrinsic immorality in breaking NCAA rules. Byers indicated that this attitude had become very common; in fact, he noted that now fewer cheaters demonstrate any remorse.

This lack of remorse is evident in our case material. For example, coaches who have been involved in cheating often feel very ill-used when they are fired. In our cases, one notorious coach refused to use the word "guilty" in his letter of resignation, insisting that he was only "responsible" for "mistakes." Later, he went on the lecture circuit to defend himself. Several coaches believed they were being used as "scapegoats." They believed that their superiors wanted them to cheat in order to improve the team's competitive position, but once this was achieved, the administration withdrew its support and protection. One coach, in fact, claimed that he knew his job was in danger as soon as his team had achieved its first major success. He saw the university president and several boosters dancing together in the stands (with the team symbol painted on their noses), and knew that his days were numbered. Coaches also believe that others have been instrumental in the cheating, but that (because they are highly visible) they have been singled out for punishment.

Another version of this scapegoat theory involves the NCAA. Since it is commonly thought that "everyone" cheats, the decision to investigate only certain schools is seen as inherently unfair. Some coaches claim that certain schools are left untouched because of their influence with the governing body. These schools are supposed to be on an alleged "Sacred Cow List," which protects them from investigation. This belief opens up to coaches the possibility that the investigators are carrying on a personal vendetta, which increases their feelings of ill-use.

Comparison Schools: These schools have presumably already achieved the prestige advantages of a winning program. They are at the top, and have abundant positive publicity; therefore, they should have little need to improve their competitive position. Perhaps this helps to explain the ability of these schools to avoid cheating.

Uncertain Tenure of Coaches: In our cases, coaches at institutions which cheat have extremely uncertain tenure. For example, in one school, no head football coach since 1933 had left his job of his own volition. This situation obviously contributes to competitive pressure. The coach's job security often depends on creating a winning team within one or two seasons, and the administration may be wuick to replace him if this goal is not met. (Since he often must retrain the team and recruit new players, one or two years may not be enough time.) In some instances, the administration expresses its interest in winning by including in the coach's contract a provision that he be paid a sizeable bonus if the team achieves a championship.

Comparison Schools: Long tenure for coaches characterizes our comparison schools. Both had coaches who became deeply identified with the school and stayed for years, even when presented with more lucrative offers. In one case, the school had a deliberate policy of keeping any coach it hired for at least five years, even if he did not maintain a winning record.

Administrative Independence of the Athletic Department: One of the most characteristic features of our case schools was an absence of adequate administrative supervision of the athletic program. This may stem directly from the organizational structure of the university. State schools are sometimes set up so that the athletic department is separate from the rest of the institution: its budget and facilities may even be set up as a separate corporation. Special travel funds, athletic scholarships, building funds, and special facilities for athletes are sometimes not supervised by regular institutional procedures. The athletic department may also take over certain functions which are normally performed for students by other university departments. It may in practice admit, counsel, and run special classes entirely for its own athletes.

Granted this degree of independence, the nature of supervision becomes very critical. In one of our cases, supervision of any kind was apparently non-existent because the administrative hierarchy was unclear. The president created the position of athletic director after he had hired the head coach. The A.D. did not have clear authority over the coach. Both assumed they reported directly to the president, but he had little interest in the athletic program. There were no regular procedures for ethical supervision, nor had the president delegated this responsibility to anyone else. After the school was put on probation, the administration pointed to this confusion as the cause of their problems. In two of our three cheating cases, the athletic directors claimed not to have clear control over the activities of the coaching staff. They felt they had been made responsible for behavior which they could not control.

It should not be assumed, however, that the influence of the athletic director would always be in the direction of strict enforcement, even if he were administratively able to manage it. In our third case, the A.D. was, in fact, a very powerful figure, but the athletic program he ran was among the most notorious in recent memory.

Perhaps because of such administrative laxity, the NCAA has begun to require specific administrative reforms as part of an institution's probation. Their suggested reforms have generally been in the direction of spreading administrative responsibility for the athletic program among other offices of the university. The NCAA has recommended, for example, that the business office should control athletic department travel funds, or that athletic dormitories should be returned to the residence hall authority. In a recent penalty, the last year of a school's probation was made dependent upon the accomplishment of specific reforms of this kind. It has been suggested that this novel approach was tried because of the NCAA's experience with another major violator: that institution promised reforms which never materialized. (The promise itself may be valuable to the school. It is commonly believed that a school which demonstrates its cooperation with the NCAA will receive a relatively mild penalty.)

Such reforms may be very difficult to accomplish because of university politics at the institution. In one of our cases, the athletic director was a very powerful figure, with important friends on the Board of Directors, and among boosters. Even after three major scandals in ten years, this A.D. was able to marshall a powerful faction within the university to prevent the reduction of his powers. The university president resigned after loosing the confidence of the Board in the athletic reforms he had proposed. But the A.D. was only "transferred" to another part of the university. He left rather than accept this reassignment. Not only was he never fired, he never had to publicly accept any responsibility for the situation in the athletic department.

Comparison Schools: Although complete information about the administrative structures of these schools was unavailable, it appears that the athletic departments were less administratively independent than in the other institutions. One institution had assigned supervision of the athletic program in all its aspects, including recruitment and admission of students, to a university vice-president. This official was given clear responsibility for all aspects of the program. In the other instance, this responsibility was clearly vested in the A.D.

The Administrative Response: None of the schools in our cases seem to have been prepared for the possibility of an NCAA investigation. There were no instituted procedures for dealing with the self-investigation which is required when NCAA charges are field. In fact, the response of these administrators has an ad-hoc and vacillating quality. Coaches are fired and then temporarily kept on, players who might be ineligible are removed from games and then reinstated, assurances of innocence are issued before any investigation has been made. Administrators have released "statements" from faculty witnesses which had not yet been given, and which were quite different from what the professors intended to say. In their official rhetoric, administrators tend to minimize the evidence of cheating, and frequently refer to serious and persistent patterns of cheating as "a little sloppiness." They may claim that the problem is one of administrative carelessness, creating "an appearance of wrong-doing," rather than any deliberate intention to cheat.

In our cases, the administration has demonstrated an extreme sensitivity to bad publicity. It is possible to limit the damage that an athletic scandal does to a school's reputation because the NCAA does not make specific details of its investigations public. A school may undergo a major investigation, but only the sketchiest details of the abuses will become common knowledge. Information management is, therefore, a major priority of administrators faced with a crisis in the sports program.

Whether or not the NCAA investigation becomes a major public scandal does not entirely depend on the seriousness of the abuses. Extrinsic factors have an important effect on creating a scandal. Our cases allow us to identify three: the existence of a concurrent police investigation, the state laws involving the disclosure of public documents (for state universities), and the intense interest of the media. University administrators have no control over police investigations or over their state's sunshine laws. Of the three, the media are the most potentially open to manipulation by the institution's administration.

Administrative response to NCAA investigations is therefore marked by high levels of controversy with the media. Administrators write letters to newspapers, accusing them of irresponsible journal-

ism, or they attempt to apply pressure on television networks which are about to air details of the charges. In one instance, a university threatened to withdraw its team from a televised game on a network which was planning to air a segment about its cheating. At the same time, they attempted to create rumors about the network's "ulterior motives" and about the personal character of the reporters. Schools seem to respond most aggressively to publicity on national television. In the case described above, most of the details of the network's segment had been available for six months, in a local newspaper, but the administration had not reacted.

Internal investigations in schools with persistent patterns of cheating seem to be very inadequate. It is difficult to get specific information on these investigations, but one common charge is that athletic department personnel—potentially under suspicion themselves—have been allowed to participate in questioning witnesses. Another common charge is that administrators have too easily accepted the assurances given to them by the athletic department. They tend to accept the word of colleagues as gentlemen (if not scholars). The investigation may, therefore, consist of little more than asking the individuals involved if they know of any wrong-doing. These assurances may be accepted as adequate until the university is forced by negative publicity to be more thorough. In one case, a genuine investigation did not begin until after the formal notification of NCAA charges was sent, although the NCAA had been interviewing on campus for two years.

Perhaps the inadequacy of these investigations is the result of lack of preparation for dealing with ethical problems. None of the case schools had an established plan for self-investigation. In some instances, the administrators may have been stalling, hoping not to discover all the facts. In one case, documents became available to the press which indicated that the university at least considered what it called "sitting tight" and finding out as little as possible. (These documents were internal staff memos from the university's lawyer.) Eventually, damaging revelations in the press forced the university to carry out a thorough investigation, and the coach was fired. But without such media attention, it seems quite possible for an institution to protect its reputation by stonewalling. It may even be a useful strategy for dealing with the NCAA, since it will make abuses more difficult to prove.

Comparison Schools: Our comparison schools had a clear policy about cheating: they had decided not to do so, and new employees were informed of the policy. In one instance, the university president had prepared a speech on the subject which left it clear that cheaters would be fired. It also indicated clearly that the president expected to hear about such cheating if it occurred.

Because their offenses have been restricted to minor technical violations (like improper use of playing fields), it is impossible to say how these schools would have responded to a full-scale self-investigation.

The Role of Fans and Boosters: Large sports programs generally have officially sanctioned fan clubs attached to them. Their funds are used for legal purposes, like providing scholarships, running sports facilities, and new building programs. They raise money through the same of season tickets, donations, sale of souveniers, etc. Some of these organizations are quite rich: one in our cases took in as much as $5 million a year. Where these funds are publicly accounted for it is more difficult to use them for unethical purposes. In our cases, official fan clubs do not seem to be implicated in the pattern of cheating.

However, certain wealthy fans may provide funds for a sports program's unethical activities. This money is not subject to public accounting, and is much easier to hide from the NCAA. In some instances, it seems to be handled as part of the booster's business. In other cases, a small group of boosters may form an unofficial fan club to handle the money.

Boosters provide the large payments which some athletes receive for signing their letters of intent. (In one of our cases, a top-ranked athlete reported that a booster gave him a shoe box full of money.) Boosters provide other resources: fishing trips for recruits, hotel accommodations, private jets to fly the coach to athletes' home towns, champagne for athletes' families, jobs for their relatives, summer employment for the athletes themselves, cash allowances, etc. (All of the above occurred in our cases. Some of them are not against NCAA rules: it is apparently legal for a booster to give an athlete's uncle a job or to give him a good deal on a car.) Boosters also support the athletic program with legal donations. In one instance, a booster donated more than $1 million in a single gift.

Such boosters—all wealthy businessmen—were known to be influential in each of the three cases we examined. When the school's cheating became public, these men generally denied any wrongdoing, claiming that they did not know how the coach was using the resources they had provided. However, the NCAA regularly requests that universities "disassociate" themselves from particular boosters as part of their probation agreements. The NCAA does not make the boosters' name public, but they are often common knowledge. One booster bragged openly about having "recruited" certain athletes by himself, and continued to call himself the school's "ambassador" even after he was ordered to sever his association with the team.

Published sources do not provide much evidence about how boosters gain influence in athletic departments. In one instance where information is available, the coach requested a booster's aid when he decided that legal recruiting would not work. In two other instances, boosters were reported to be personal friends of the coach or the athletic director.

Boosters may have strong ties with individuals who are powerful in the university. At one institution, boosters were able to combine with certain members of the Board of Directors and the athletic director to block administrative reform of the athletic department. (Since a number of the individuals involved had previously played football for that institution, it seems possible that they had long-standing ties of friendship.)

Comparison Schools: Our comparison schools have very devoted fans: one institution set the national record for attendance at home games for two consecutive years. The other institution is famous for attracting non-alumni into the ranks of its most avid supporters. This university limited the role of fans by not authorizing any official fan clubs at all. Donations could be made through all-purpose alumni clubs, but could not be ear-marked for the athletic program. This arrangement presumably strengthened the institution's control over boosters, as well as improving supervision of athletic funds.

Summary

1. Recruiting abuses are the most important category of cheating, because they affect the ability of the team to change its competitive position.

2. A variety of means are used to admit unqualified students, or to maintain their eligibility to play. This results in the miseducation of athletes.

3. Abuse of both street and prescription drugs occurs in our cases. Drug abuse may have particularly severe repercussions for athletic programs because of the publicity and police investigations they engender.

4. Serious cheating seems to be associated with the desire of a school to raise its competitive standing. Prestige may therefore be a more important force in creating cheating than economic considerations. A variety of beliefs are used to justify cheating.

5. Serious cheating may be connected with short term and uncertain tenure of coaches.

6. Ethical supervision is made more difficult by the administrative independence of the athletic program.

7. The response of administrators is marked by a. inadequate internal investigations and b. attempts to prevent negative publicity.

8. Boosters are instrumental in providing funds for illegal recruiting and other payments. They may become involved in internal political struggles in the university; their effect is to block reform.

Conclusions

The responsibility for the existence of cheating in a university sports program is widely shared. Even though it may be the coach who takes the actual decision to cheat, it seems likely that others in these institutions know about the unethical practices. Registrars and athletic directors, for instance, have been successful in claiming ignorance, but there is a strong presumption that they condoned cheating by their silence. Even university presidents may be assumed to know more than they say they do; especially in those instances in which they have hired coaches under suspicion of cheating elsewhere.

Even if these administrators have not been directly involved in cheating, it may be argued that they have failed in their supervisory responsibilities. No administrator in our cases was fired from his position on these grounds. Perhaps this is because supervisory procedures are so informal. It would be difficult to hold someone responsible for failing in a responsibility that was not clearly his in the first place.

For these reasons, it is our conclusion that it would be useful for institutions to clearly specify supervisory and investigative responsibility. An administrator's lack of knowledge of the activities of the cheaters under him should not be considered an exculpation.

An explicit university policy against cheating would also be useful. There should be a clear understanding that knowledge of cheating will be relayed to the top, and that it will be acted upon. Without these assurances, it is easy to assume that administrators condone cheating; that cheating is the required behavior, despite the rules.

Of course, in some institutions, an informal understanding that cheating is acceptable probably does exist. In these cases, it is unlikely that any formal changes in policy or procedure will be very effective in stopping it. Whatever new rules are adopted, new ways will be found to subvert them.

The ultimate solution to the problem of cheating in college sports must, therefore, look beyond the university's administrative structure. If we are to address the pressures which seem to underlie cheating, we must first understand how they are generated. Our case studies indicate some useful areas for further research. First, we believe that the university's means of achieving prestige must be examined. It would be useful to know, for example, if a rise in academic prestige makes cheating more costly for the university, and tends to discourage it. Second, our cases serve to remind us that cheating always exists as part of the university's informal structure. In order to understand why it exists at a particular institution, this informal structure must be investigated. The beliefs people hold about cheating, their understanding of the expectations of their superiors, the ties of friendship and loyalty which they establish, the existence of factions for and againt reform, are all important to understand.

Cheating in college sports is a complex institutional process, and a model of complex causality must be used in order to understand it.

Part II

The Survey

II-A

Detailed Survey Data

Survey of University Presidents

Leadership

The recent Clark Kerr study for the Association of Governing Boards painted a somewhat disappointing picture of the presidency. We would like to request that you answer some specific questions on this subject.

1. How many more years do you think that you will stay in your current position? _____ years.

Years	*Response Frequency*	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
0	4	6.2	7.3	7.3
1	5	7.7	9.1	16.4
2	6	9.2	10.9	27.3
3	2	3.1	3.6	30.9
4	4	6.2	7.3	38.2
5	6	9.2	10.9	49.1
6	1	1.5	1.8	50.9
7	4	6.2	7.3	58.2
8	7	10.8	12.7	70.9
9	2	3.1	3.6	74.5
10	8	12.3	14.5	89.1
12	2	3.1	3.6	92.7
14	2	3.1	3.6	96.4
15	1	1.5	1.8	98.2
16	1	1.5	1.8	100.0

2. Why will you leave? _____ To do something different. _____ To accept another position. _____ To retire. _____ To go into business, industry or government. _____ To go into teaching full time.

	Value	*Response Frequency*	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Dif Type Pos	1	9	13.8	16.4	16.4
Another Pos	2	10	15.4	18.2	34.5
Retire	3	15	23.1	27.3	61.8
Bus Ind Govt	4	17	26.2	30.9	92.7
Teach Full	5	4	6.2	7.3	100.0

3. How long have you been in your current position? _____ years.

Value	*Response Frequency*	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
0	2	3.1	3.1	3.1
1	7	10.8	10.8	13.8
2	8	12.3	12.3	26.2
3	6	9.2	9.2	35.4
4	8	12.3	12.3	47.7
5	2	3.1	3.1	50.8
6	7	10.8	10.8	61.5
7	5	7.7	7.7	69.2
8	3	4.6	4.6	73.8
9	1	1.5	1.5	75.4
10	4	6.2	6.2	81.5
11	2	3.1	3.1	84.6
13	2	3.1	3.1	87.7
15	1	1.5	1.5	89.2
16	1	1.5	1.5	90.8
17	1	1.5	1.5	92.3
18	1	1.5	1.5	93.8
20	2	3.1	3.1	96.9
30	1	1.5	1.5	98.5
33	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

4. What are the three most difficult issues you have to deal with as president?

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Funds	30	46.2	46.9	46.9
Int Govern	12	18.5	18.8	65.6
Ext Govern	9	13.8	14.1	79.7
Ext Relations	1	1.5	1.6	81.3
Athletics	4	6.2	6.3	87.5
Enrollment	2	3.1	3.1	90.6
Other	6	9.2	9.4	100.0

5. How would you rate the importance of the following leadership qualities to a successful president?

Imp of Strategic Vision

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Very Important	63	96.9	96.9	96.9
Important	2	3.1	3.1	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of Board Relations

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	57	87.7	87.7	87.7
Important	8	12.3	12.3	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of Faculty Relations

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	53	81.5	82.8	82.8
Important	11	16.9	17.2	100.0
Missing	1	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of External Community Relations

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	44	67.7	68.8	68.8
Important	20	30.8	31.3	100.0
Missing	1	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of Building Teamwork

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	46	70.8	70.8	70.8
Important	19	29.2	29.2	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of Encouraging Ind Initiative

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	41	63.1	63.1	63.1
Important	24	36.9	36.9	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of Educ Prof Leadership

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	35	53.8	53.8	53.8
Important	26	40.0	40.0	93.8
Not Important	4	6.2	6.2	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Imp of Good Ideas

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Important	37	56.9	56.9	56.9
Important	27	41.5	41.5	98.5
Not Important	1	1.5	1.5	100.0
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

6. What are the three most important issues that university presidents will face in the next five years?

*1 Important Issue in 5 Years

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Funds	27	41.5	44.3	44.3
Faculty	2	3.1	3.3	47.5
Enrollment	15	23.1	24.6	72.1
Change	4	6.2	6.6	78.7
Academic Quality	6	9.2	9.8	88.5
Athletics	2	3.1	3.3	91.8
Ind Pub Support	2	3.1	3.3	95.1
Other	3	4.6	4.9	100.0
Missing	4	6.2	MISSING	
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

7. How much support do you believe higher education can expect over the next decade from the following sectors?

	More	About the Same	Less
Federal Government	3%	37%	60%
State Government	26%	59%	15%
Alumni	72%	28%	–
Business/Industry	82%	17%	1%

Athletics

The difficulties facing American colleges and universities in the area of intercollegiate athletics seems to be worsening. We would like to explore this topic with a few questions, remembering that this questionnaire is confidential and your answers can *never* be revealed.

1. My university participates in intercollegiate football _____ and basketball _____ (check if appropriate) at the NCAA Division I-A level.

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Football	3	4.6	4.9	4.9
Basketball	16	24.6	26.2	31.1
Both	39	60.0	63.9	95.1
Missing	3	4.6	4.9	100.0

2. There are serious problems with athletic programs at many universities. _____ Yes _____No.

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
No	6	9.2	9.4	9.4
Yes	58	89.2	90.6	100.0
Missing	1	1.5	MISSING	
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

3. I am fearful of the possibility of serious problems in our athletic program. _____ Yes _____No.

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
No	44	67.7	69.8	69.8
Yes	19	29.2	30.2	100.0
Missing	2	3.1	MISSING	
TOTAL	65	100.0	100.0	

Type of Possible Problems–1

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Funds	5	7.7	27.8	27.8
Competitive Pres	4	6.2	2.2	50.0
Academics	3	4.6	16.7	66.7
Alumni-Boosters	2	3.1	11.1	77.8
Discipline-Drugs	1	1.5	5.6	83.3
Other	3	4.6	16.7	100.0

Valid Cases–63; Missing Cases–2

Type of Problems–2

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Competitive Pres	1	1.5	20.0	20.0
Alumni-Boosters	3	4.6	60.0	80.0
Other	1	1.5	20.0	100.0

Reason Not Fearful of Problems–1

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Int Control	24	36.9	96.0	96.0
Small Program	1	1.5	4.0	100.0

4. We have serious problems with our athletic program.

Yes	77%
No	23%

Type of Problem–1

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Funds	11	16.9	73.3	73.3
Academics	2	3.1	13.3	86.7
Other	2	3.1	13.3	100.0

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Competitive Pres	1	1.5	16.7	16.7
Alumni-Boosters	2	3.1	33.3	50.0
Discipline-Drugs	1	1.5	16.7	66.7
Other	2	3.1	33.3	100.0

5. What are the primary factors in the potential destabilization of college athletics? (Check as many as apply.)

Money	21%
Overzealous supporters	22%
Alumni/Fan Pressure for Winners	29%
Organized Crime	3%
Drugs	27%

6. Do you know of any division I-A universities which have good reputations for excellence in both athletics and academics and have the situation well under control?

Factor-1 in Athletic Problems

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Poor Admin Control	11	16.9	19.6	19.6
Funds	11	16.9	19.6	39.3
Competitive Pres	13	20.0	23.2	62.5
Recruiting	6	9.2	10.7	73.2
Alumni-Boosters	5	7.7	8.9	82.1
Academics	8	12.3	14.3	96.4
Other	2	3.1	3.6	100.0

Factor-2 in Athletic Problems

	Response Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Poor Admin Control	6	9.2	14.6	14.6
Funds	6	9.2	14.2	29.3
Competitive Pres	4	6.2	9.8	39.0
Discipline-Drugs	4	6.2	9.8	48.8
Recruiting	1	1.5	2.4	51.2
Alumni-Boosters	7	10.8	17.1	68.3
Academics	7	10.8	17.1	85.4
Other	6	9.2	14.6	100.0

Factor-3 in Athletic Problems

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Poor Admin Control	3	4.6	27.3	27.3
Competitive Pres	4	6.2	36.4	63.6
Recruiting	1	1.5	9.1	72.7
Academics	1	1.5	9.1	81.8
Other	2	3.1	18.2	100.0

7. There are many individuals and groups that are involved in controlling athletic programs at NCAA division I-A universities. For your institution please rate the following individuals/group from 1-5 (high to low) in terms of how much control they have over various elements of athletic programs.

Figure 1 – Athletic Control Matrix for All Institutions

	Budget	*Academics*	*Appt of Coaches*	*Auditing*	*Student Aid*	*Total*
President	245	169	200	208	154	966
Academic VP	108	197	99	89	109	602
Other VP	152	80	106	156	127	621
Athletic Dir	235	191	249	198	225	1098
Coaches	159	171	94	89	167	680
TOTAL	889	808	748	740	782	3967

Figure 2 – Athletic Control Matrix for Four Exemplary Institutions

	Budget	*Academics*	*Appt of Coaches*	*Auditing*	*Student Aid*	*Total*
President	20	20	16	20	17	95
Academic VP	19	13	10	10	9	61
Other VP	20	17	18	19	19	93
Athletic Dir	18	17	18	15	14	82
TOTAL	71	67	62	64	59	331

8. In your opinion, can university presidents resolve this dilemma?

Yes	72%
No	5%
Other/Maybe	23%

If yes, how?

(1)	Take control	70%
(2)	Rely on NCAA/CONF	30%

9. Do you know of any division I-A universities which have good reputations for excellence in both athletics and academics and have the situation well under control?

Yes	84
No	16

Name three to five.

	Response Frequency	*Percent*
Stanford	7	10.8
Michigan	8	12.3
Notre Dame	4	6.2
Duke	5	7.7
UNC	2	3.1
Penn State	2	3.1
UVA	2	3.1

Women's Athletics

For several years women's athletic programs have grown rapidly because of Title IX regulations and other factors. What about the future?

Do you feel the same degree of urgency and pressure to support women's athletic programs now as in the past year?

Yes	55%
No	45%

If the answer is yes, where is the pressure coming from?

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Pres.-Policy	20	30.8	58.8	58.8
Internal	7	10.8	20.6	79.4
External	5	7.7	14.7	94.1
Other	2	3.1	5.9	100.0

Do you expect to continue expanding women's athletic programs at your university in the immediate future?

Yes	50%
No	50%

How many women's athletic programs does your university now sponsor?

Seven

How many men's programs?

Eight (Median figures)

Do you anticipate that women's athletic programs will begin to experience some of the same problems that men's programs are now having?

Yes	51%
No	49%

Do you anticipate different problems with women's programs?

Yes	36%
No	64%

If yes, what?

	Response Frequency	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
Funds	8	12.3	44.4	44.4
Acceptance	5	7.7	27.8	72.2
Competitive Pres	1	1.5	5.6	77.8
Control	2	3.1	11.1	88.9
Same as Men	1	1.5	5.6	94.4
Other	1	1.5	5.6	100.0

Type of Institution:

Public 85% or Private 15%

Enrollment

Value	*Response Frequency*	*Percent*	*Valid Percent*	*Cum Percent*
5000	2	3.1	3.1	3.1
5700	1	1.5	1.6	4.7
6000	3	4.6	4.7	9.4
6500	1	1.5	1.6	10.9
7000	1	1.5	1.6	12.5
9200	1	1.5	1.6	14.1
9500	1	1.5	1.6	15.6
10000	3	4.6	4.7	20.3
11000	4	6.2	6.3	26.6
11332	1	1.5	1.6	28.1
11500	2	3.1	3.1	31.3
12000	3	4.6	4.7	35.9
12500	1	1.5	1.6	37.5
14000	1	1.5	1.6	39.1
15000	4	6.2	6.3	45.3
15500	1	1.5	1.6	46.9
16000	1	1.5	1.6	50.0
17000	2	3.1	3.1	53.1
17500	1	1.5	1.6	54.7
18000	1	1.5	1.6	56.3
19984	1	1.5	1.6	57.8
20000	4	6.2	6.3	64.1
20300	1	1.5	1.6	65.6
20500	1	1.5	1.6	67.2
21000	2	3.1	3.1	70.3

21416	1	1.5	1.6	73.4
22000	1	1.5	1.6	75.0
23500	1	1.5	1.6	76.6
25000	1	1.5	1.6	78.1
26500	2	3.1	3.1	81.3
29000	1	1.5	1.6	82.8
30000	1	1.5	1.6	84.4
31000	2	3.1	3.1	87.5
32000	1	1.5	1.6	89.1
35000	2	3.1	3.1	92.2
40000	1	1.5	1.6	93.8
44000	1	1.5	1.6	95.3
45000	1	1.5	1.6	96.9
55000	1	1.5	1.6	98.4
56000	1	1.5	1.6	100.0

II-B

Survey Form

CENTER FOR POLICY STUDIES IN EDUCATION

George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Survey of University Presidents

This survey is designed to solicit the views of university presidents on key issues facing American higher education. The form takes approximately fifteen (15) minutes to complete. The results will be reported to the higher education community and the general public but only in aggregate figures so that no institution or president can be identified.

Principal Researchers
Dr. Anthony Hickey, Assistant Graduate Dean and Professor of Sociology
Dr. J. Wade Gilley, Vice President and Professor of Higher Education

Leadership

The recent Clark Kerr study for the Association of Governing Boards painted a somewhat disappointing picture of the presidency. We would like to request that you answer some specific questions on this subject.

1. How many more years do you think that you will stay in your current position? _____ years.

2. Why will you leave? _____ To do something different. _____ To accept another position. _____ To retire. _____ To go into business, industry or government. _____ To go into teaching full time.

3. How long have you been in your current position? _____ years.

4. What are the three most difficult issues you have to deal with as president?

_____

_____

_____

5. How would you rate the importance of the following leadership qualities to a successful president?

	Very Important	Important	Not Important
Possessing a strategic vision for the institution	_____	_____	_____
Forging a good working relationship with			
—the board	_____	_____	_____
—the faculty	_____	_____	_____
—external community	_____	_____	_____
Building teamwork	_____	_____	_____
Encourage individual initiative	_____	_____	_____
Providing educational professional leadership	_____	_____	_____
Having good ideas yourself	_____	_____	_____

6. What are the three most important issues that university presidents will face in the next five years?

_____

_____

_____

7. How much support do you believe higher education can expect over the next decade from the following sectors?

	More	About the Same	Less
—Federal Government	_____	_____	_____
—State Government	_____	_____	_____
—Alumni	_____	_____	_____
—Business/Industry	_____	_____	_____

Athletics

The difficulties facing American colleges and universities in the area of intercollegiate athletics seems to be worsening. We would like to explore this topic with a few questions, remembering that this questionnaire is confidential and your answers can *never* be revealed.

1. My university participates in intercollegiate football _____ and basketball _____ (check if appropriate) at the NCAA Division I-A level.

2. There are serious problems with athletic programs at many universities. _____ Yes _____ No.

3. I am fearful of the possibility of serious problems in our athletic program. _____ Yes _____ No.

   Why?

   _____

   _____

   _____

4. We have serious problems with our athletic program. _____ Yes _____ No.

   What is the nature of your problems?

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. What are the primary factors in the potential destabilization of college athletics? (Check as many as apply.) _____ money. _____ overzealous supporters. _____ alumni/fan pressure for winners. _____ organized crime. _____ drugs.

6. What are the most important factors involved in the problems of athletic programs at many universities?

_____

_____

7. There are many individuals and groups that are involved in controlling athletic programs at NCAA division I-A universities. For your institution please rate the following individuals/group from 1-5 (high to low) in terms of how much control they have over various elements of athletic programs.

	Budget	**Academic Programs of Athletics**	**Appointment of Coaches**	**Auditing**	**Financial Aid for Athletics**
President	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Vice President, Academic Affairs/ Provost	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Other Vice President (title _____)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Athletic Director	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Coaches	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Alumni	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Governing Board	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Athletic Boosters	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
NCAA	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Accreditation organizations	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

8. In your opinion, can university presidents resolve this dilemma?

_____ Yes. _____ No.

If yes, how? _____

_____

_____

If no, who can? _____

_____

_____

9. Do you know of any division I-A universities which have good reputations for excellence in both athletics and academics and have the situation well under control? _____ Yes _____ No.

   Name three to five.

   _____

   _____

   _____

Women's Athletics

For several years women's athletic programs have grown rapidly because of Title IX regulations and other factors. What about the future?

Do you feel the same degree of urgency and pressure to support women's athletic programs now as in the past year? _____ Yes _____ No.

If the answer is yes where is the pressure coming from?

_____

_____

Do you expect to continue expanding women's athletic programs at your university in the immediate future? _____ Yes _____ No.

How many women's athletic programs does your university now sponsor _____? How many men's programs _____?

Do you anticipate that women's athletic programs will begin to experience some of the same problems that men's programs are now having? _____ Yes _____ No.

Do you anticipate different problems with women's programs?
_____ Yes _____ No.

If yes what?

_____

_____

Type of Institution:

Enrollment _____

Public _____ or Private _____

Thank you for taking the time from your busy schedule to help us with this study. We will make sure that you get a copy of the results.

II-C

List of Institutions Surveyed

List of Institutions Surveyed

Alabama

University of Alabama—University
University of Alabama in Birmingham*
University of Alabama in Huntsville*
Auburn University

Arizona

Arizona State University*
Northern Arizona University*
University of Arizona

Arkansas

University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas at Little Rock*

California

Stanford University
University of California—Berkeley*
University of California—Los Angeles
University of San Francisco
University of Southern California

Colorado

Colorado State University*
University of Colorado—Boulder
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Connecticut

University of Connecticut*

District of Columbia

American University*
Georgetown University
George Washington University*

Florida

Florida State University*
University of Florida—Gainesville
University of Miami

Georgia

Georgia Institute of Technology*
Georgia State University
University of Georgia

Idaho

Boise State University
Idaho State University*
University of Idaho

Illinois

Northwestern University
University of Illinois

**Responded to survey*

Indiana

Indiana University
Purdue University*
University of Notre Dame*

Iowa

Iowa State University
University of Iowa

Kansas

Kansas State University
University of Kansas
Wichita State University*

Kentucky

Eastern Kentucky University
University of Kentucky*
University of Louisville*
Western Kentucky University*

Louisiana

Louisiana State University*
Tulane University*
University of New Orleans*

Maryland

University of Maryland—College Park*

Michigan

Central Michigan University*
Eastern Michigan University*
University of Michigan—Ann Arbor*
Wayne State University*
Western Michigan University
Michigan State University*

Minnesota

St. Cloud State University
Winona State University*
University of Minnesota

Mississippi

Mississippi State University*
University of Mississippi*
University of Southern Mississippi*

Missouri

University of Missouri
University of Missouri—Columbia*
University of Missouri—St. Louis*
University of Missouri—Rolla*

Montana

Montana State University*
University of Montana

Nebraska

University of Nebraska

Nevada

University of Nevada—Las Vegas*

New Jersey

Rutgers University*

New Mexico

University of New Mexico
New Mexico State University

New York

Columbia University
St. John's University
Syracuse University*

North Carolina

Duke University
East Carolina University*
North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University

**Responded to survey*

University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill*
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Wake Forest University*
Western Carolina University

Ohio

Bowling Green University
Miami University
Ohio State University*
Ohio University*
University of Akron*
University of Toledo*

Oklahoma

Oklahoma State University
University of Oklahoma*
University of Tulsa*

Oregon

Oregon State University*
Portland State University
University of Oregon

Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania State University*
Temple University*
University of Pennsylvania*
University of Pittsburgh*
Villanova University

South Carolina

Clemson University
University of South Carolina

Tennessee

Austin Peay State University
East Tennessee State University
Memphis State University
Middle Tennessee State University*
Tennessee Technological University
University of Tennessee
University of Tennessee—Knoxville

Texas

Baylor University
East Texas State University*
North Texas State University*
Rice University
Southern Methodist University
Texas A & M University*
Texas Christian University
Texas Tech University
University of Houston*
University of Texas at Austin*
West Texas State University*

Utah

Brigham Young University
University of Utah*
Utah State University

Virginia

College of William and Mary
George Mason University*
James Madison University
Old Dominion University*
University of Virginia*
Virginia Commonwealth University*
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University*

Washington

University of Washington*
Washington State University*

West Virginia

Marshall University*
West Virginia University

Wisconsin

University of Wisconsin—Madison
University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee*

Wyoming

University of Wyoming

**Responded to survey*